

CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15
(legislative day of May 13), 1935*

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Alexander M. McDaniel, Bunnell.
Elwin A. Acree, Groveland.
Elizabeth A. Cantrell, Kissimmee.
Mark L. Calder, Titusville.
Albert W. Kelso, Winter Haven.

WYOMING

Cecil W. Clark, Newcastle.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.

It lays upon us solemn obligations; it enjoins obedience to the highest and best; it counsels righteousness and gives rich compensations. Almighty God, may we heed its call. Let us be severely true with ourselves by cultivating impartiality of judgment, sincerity of demeanor and action. With so many, blessed Father of mercy, this world means toil and trial; they climb the steep, barren, and rugged ways of life. We beseech Thee to sanctify their misfortunes; cheer them with Thy presence and help them to learn how to break forth into sweet song. Mercifully regard those who are prosperous and happy; deny them not of these blessings. The Lord God lead them to understand that every man's surplus is another one's need. Out of their abundant store may rich treasures of comfort and contentment overflow to others. Spare us from that egotism that blinds us to our brother's right and violates his property, reputation, and happiness. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 8, 1935, the President approved and signed joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution extending the gratitude of the Nation to Admiral Byrd and to the members of his expedition; and

H. J. Res. 274. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of a special joint committee to meet with other representatives of the Government in greeting Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd upon his return from his second Antarctic expedition.

PRESIDENT'S FARM ADDRESS

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday afternoon the President of the United States addressed a gathering of 5,000 farmers on the White House lawn. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting that militant speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday 5,000 farmers from 25 States came to Washington, at their own expense, in order to express their deep gratitude and appreciation to the President and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the agricultural program. The like of this great demonstration has never before been witnessed in Washington. It was a fine and truly representative body of farmers, who from the depths of their hearts came here to attest to a program that is today restoring American agriculture. While it could be properly termed a meeting of thanksgiving, this

great assemblage let it be understood in no uncertain tones that this program must go on, and that they would stand like a stone wall against all efforts to weaken or destroy it.

Gathered on the lawn of the White House yesterday afternoon, they were addressed by the President of the United States, the man who is both their hope and inspiration. I take pleasure in extending my remarks by inserting this militant speech.

THE TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S FARM SPEECH—THIRD YEAR OF POLICY OF ADJUSTMENT BEGUN, HE POINTS OUT

I am glad to welcome you to the National Capital. We can think of this occasion as a kind of surprise birthday party, for it was just 2 years and 2 days ago that the Agricultural Adjustment Act became a law. And I well remember the fine group of representatives of farmers from every part of the Union who stood around me on that occasion when I signed the act.

In record time you and thousands of other farmers took hold and set up machinery to control your own affairs and put the new law to work.

I remember, too, the many high and mighty people who said you could not do it—that it was no use for you to try—intimating clearly that their only remedy to improve your situation was to let the sheriffs' sales go on. That was the old and very familiar way the high and mighty balanced farm production with demand. Those people did not understand and many of them do not understand today that, if the farm population of the United States suffers and loses its purchasing power, the people in the cities, of necessity, suffer with them. One of the greatest lessons that the city dwellers have come to understand in this past 2 years is this: Empty pocketbooks on the farm don't turn factory wheels in the city.

Go back for a minute to the spring of 1933—when there was a huge carry-over of almost 13,000,000 bales and a price, because of that carry-over, of 6 cents a pound. You and I know what 6-cent cotton means to the purchasing power of the Cotton Belt.

There was a huge carry-over of tobacco and the price of tobacco during the preceding 6 months was the lowest on record for many years—wheat, with a carry-over of nearly 400,000,000 bushels, and a price of 35 cents on the farm; corn, with a price of 15 cents a bushel on many farms; hogs, selling at 3 cents a pound.

You and I know what that meant in the way of purchasing power for 40,000,000 people.

When we came to Washington we were faced with three possible programs. The first involved price fixing by Government decree. This was discarded because the problem of overproduction was not solved thereby.

DUMPING POLICY SHUNNED

The second was a plan to let farmers grow as much as they wanted to and to have the Federal Government then step in, take from them that portion of their crop which represented the exportable surplus and, in their name, on their behalf, dump this surplus on the other nations of the world. That plan was discarded because the other nations of the world had already begun to stop dumping. With increasing frequency they were raising their tariffs, establishing quotas, and clamping on embargoes against just that kind of proposition.

Therefore, we came to the third plan—a plan for the adjustment of totals in our major crops so that from year to year production and consumption would be kept in reasonable balance with each other to the end that reasonable prices would be paid to farmers for their crops and to the end that unwieldy surpluses would not depress our markets and upset the balance.

We are now at the beginning of the third year of carrying out this policy. You know the results thus far attained. You know the price of cotton, of wheat, of tobacco, of corn, of hogs, and of other farm products today. Further comment on the successful partial attainment of our objective up to this time is unnecessary on my part—you know.

I want to emphasize that word "adjustment." As you know, a great many of the high and mighty—with special axes to grind—have been deliberately trying to mislead people who know nothing of farming by misrepresenting—no, why use a pussyfoot word—by lying about the kind of a farm program under which this Nation is operating today.

LED ASTRAY BY IGNORANCE

A few leading citizens have gone astray from ignorance. I must admit it. For example, the prominent city banker who was driving through upstate New York with me 4 or 5 years ago in the late fall. Everything was brown. The leaves were off the trees. We passed a beautiful green field. He asked me what it was. I told him it was winter wheat. He turned to me and said, "That is very interesting. I have always wondered about winter wheat. What I don't understand is how they are able to cut it when it gets all covered up with snow."

The other was the editor of a great metropolitan paper. He visited me down in Georgia when the cotton was nearly grown, but before the bolls had formed. Looking out over the cotton fields, he said to me:

"What a great number of raspberries they grow down here."

Raspberries was right. At 4½ cents a pound for cotton, his mistake was perhaps a natural one.

I was speaking of adjustment. It is your duty and mine to continue to educate the people of this country to the fact that adjustment means not only adjustment downward but adjustment upward. If you and I agree on a correct figure for a normal carry-over, it means that if we have a bumper crop one year we will by mutual consent reduce the next year's crop in order to even up that carry-over. At the same time, if we get a short crop in a given year, you and I agree to increase the next year's crop to make up the shortage. That is exactly what we are doing today in the case of wheat.

NOT PLOWING UNDER

It is high time for you and me to carry by education knowledge of the fact that not a single program of the A. A. A. contemplated the destruction of an acre of feed crops in the United States, in spite of what you may read or be told by people who have special axes to grind.

It is high time for you and for me to make clear that we are not plowing under cotton this year—that we did not plow it under in 1934, and that we only plowed some of it under in 1933 because the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed after a huge crop of cotton was already in the ground.

It is high time for us to repeat on every occasion that we have not wastefully destroyed food in any form. It is true that the Relief Administrator has purchased hundreds of thousands of tons of foodstuffs to feed the needy and hungry who are on the relief rolls in every part of the United States.

The crocodile tears shed by the professional mourners of an old and obsolete order over the slaughter of little pigs and other measures to reduce surplus agricultural inventories deceive very few thinking people, and least of all the farmers themselves.

CITES DESTINY OF HOGS

The acknowledged destiny of a pig is sausage, or ham, or bacon, or pork. In these forms, millions of pigs were consumed by vast numbers of needy people who otherwise would have had to do without.

Let me make one other point clear for the benefit of the millions in cities who have to buy meats. Last year the Nation suffered a drought of unparalleled intensity. If there had been no Government program, if the old order had obtained in 1933 and 1934, that drought on the cattle ranges of America and in the Corn Belt would have resulted in the marketing of thin cattle, immature hogs and in the death of these animals on the range and on the farm. Then we would have had a vastly greater shortage than we face today.

Our program saved the lives of millions of head of livestock. They are still on the range. Other millions are today canned and ready for the country to eat.

I think that you and I are agreed in seeking a continuance of a national policy which on the whole is proving successful. The memory of old conditions under which the product of a whole year's work often would not bring you the cost of transporting it to market is too fresh in your minds to let you be led astray by the solemn admonitions and specious lies of those who in the past profited most when your distress was greatest.

PRICES STILL HELD INSUFFICIENT

You remember, and I remember, that not so long ago the poor had less food to eat and less clothes to wear and that was at a time when you had to practically give away your products. Then the surpluses were greater and yet the poor were poorer than they are today and when you farmers are getting a reasonable although still an insufficient price.

I have not the time to talk with you about many other policies of your Government which affect the farm population of the country. I have not the time to go into the practical work of the Farm Credit Administration which in all of its ramifications has saved a million farms from foreclosure and has accomplished the first great reduction in exorbitant interest rates that this country has ever known.

Because your cause is so just no one has had the temerity to question the motives of your "march on Washington." It is a good omen for Government, for business, for bankers, and for the city dwellers that the Nation's farmers are becoming articulate and that they know whereof they speak.

I hope you have enjoyed your stay in Washington. Seeing your Government at first hand, you may have a better idea why its efforts at times seem lumbering and slow and complicated. On the other hand, you may have seen that we are moving faster and accomplishing more practical results than you have been led to believe by the high and mighty gentlemen I have spoken of. I want to thank you for your patience with us. I want to pledge our whole-hearted cooperation as you go forward.

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Territories, and ordered printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I am in receipt of the following letter from the Secretary of the Interior advising of the loss of enrolled bill H. R. 6084, authorizing a bond issue for the town of Ketchikan, Alaska:

I regret to report the loss of enrolled bill H. R. 6084, authorizing a bond issue of Ketchikan, Alaska, which was delivered to my

office on May 3 by a messenger from the White House. The bill was receipted for by a messenger at my door, who has no recollection, however, of this particular document. The practice is for the messenger to deliver enrolled bills to the man in charge of the incoming mail for my office, who sends them to the file room for recording. There is no record of the receipt of this bill by the recording clerk. In fact, a thorough search of the entire Department, including Public Works, has failed to discover the bill, and no one has any recollection of having handled it. I have caused everyone to search all papers in and on their desks, but without result. I am chagrined to have to report the loss of this bill in spite of the care with which enrolled bills are handled in the Department. I recommend that you ask the Congress to authorize the preparation of a duplicate. The last approval day is tomorrow, May 15.

In the circumstances, I recommend that a duplicate bill be authorized by concurrent resolution.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 15, 1935.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 21

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign a duplicate copy of the enrolled bill H. R. 6084, entitled "An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the electric light and power, water, and telephone properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co., and to finance and operate the same, and validating the preliminary proceedings with respect thereto, and for other purposes", and that the Clerk of the House be directed to transmit the same to the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, what department was this lost in?

Mr. DIMOND. According to the letter, it was lost in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. SNELL. Is that the same Department that lost \$50,000,000, which was afterwards found to have been used for relief purposes? Probably the bill will be found in somebody's hip pocket later, and if it is so found, what becomes of it?

The SPEAKER. It will not be signed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is the Department in which all of my requests for jobs are lost, and it is probably mixed up with some of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. SNELL. That being so, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, there is precedent for the signing of a duplicate bill. On February 3, 1921, a similar situation arose, and a duplicate bill was signed.

Mr. SNELL. We are not objecting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Clerk to read that this involves a bond issue of \$100,000,000?

The SPEAKER. One million dollars. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS—ECONOMIC SECURITY ACT

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 14

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Finance of the Senate be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the committee during the current session on the bill S. 1130, the Economic Security Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

GEORGIA'S ANSWER TO HER GOVERNOR

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by placing therein a copy of a speech I delivered over the radio last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me over the radio last evening:

My friends, I wish, at the outset, to express my appreciation of the courtesy extended me by the Columbia Broadcasting System in permitting me to address you.

I appear as a Member of Congress from Georgia to answer a recent address made over this system by Governor Talmadge, of that State, in the hope that I may set right the people of the State in the eyes of the Nation.

Governor Talmadge did not speak for the people of Georgia in his bitter attack upon President Roosevelt and his administration. He spoke for himself alone and for motives which will subsequently become apparent.

The speech the Governor made was little more than a fault-finding tirade and would be of no importance except for the fact that it is an attack upon a Democratic President by a Democratic Governor of a rock-ribbed Democratic State in which the President makes his part-time home.

No one would deny to the Governor the right of criticism. Independence of thought and willingness to make public declaration of views are to be commended wherever found, but there is a broad distinction between legitimate criticism and what the Governor has done—as broad as the difference between lawful procedure and anarchy.

As a Member of Congress I have indulged in criticisms myself but have undertaken to make them advisory rather than destructive. I have not accepted without resistance all the measures offered with Presidential sanction. I opposed the adoption of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and I think upon good and substantial grounds, and have not changed my views. I did not support the \$4,000,000,000 unemployment relief bill because I thought it placed a burden upon the future which the needs of the present did not justify. I have complained of what I have taken to be a tendency toward the centralization of too much power in the Federal Government through a too liberal interpretation of the Constitution, but I have recognized that the country has been in a state of emergency and quick and effective relief has demanded direct and vigorous treatment which has called for concentration of authority and power.

Governor Talmadge condemned in no unmistakable words the relief activities of the administration as extravagant waste, yet this same Governor within 2 weeks before he addressed you, wrote letters to every Member of the Georgia delegation in Congress pleading for a direct grant of \$2,000,000 for the university system in Georgia. Governor Talmadge enjoys the distinction of being the first executive of any State in the Union out of whose hands the right to administer relief was taken. His whole grievance against the administration dates back to this incident. It was alleged that he was undertaking to make a political organization out of the State relief forces; that his then executive secretary, who is now commissioner of agriculture and advocating secession from the Union, was on the relief rolls, although at the same time he was drawing a sizeable salary from the State of Georgia. There were other similar complaints which need not be detailed.

Governor Talmadge condemned the activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration as a program of scarcity. He insists that farmers should be permitted to produce to the limit of their capacity, and yet while he was commissioner of agriculture he joined with Senator Long, then Governor of Louisiana, in inaugurating the first movement for a cotton holiday in the South. It seems paradoxical to disclose at this late date that Senator Long, as Governor of Louisiana, had his legislature pass a law prohibiting cotton growers of that fertile and productive State from planting a stalk of cotton in 1931, and after the Louisiana Legislature had passed this dictatorial act, Senator Long, who was then Governor of the State, called upon all the Southern States to join in the movement, and his representative in Georgia was Governor Talmadge, then Commissioner of Agriculture.

Governor Talmadge called a mass meeting of farmers in Atlanta at that time and made every effort to force Governor Russell, who is now Senator from Georgia, to call an extraordinary session of the State legislature and fall in line with Louisiana by passing a law to prohibit the farmer of Georgia from planting a stalk of cotton during an entire year. We now find these two distinguished gentlemen, Senator Long and Governor Talmadge, as the leading critics of the agricultural adjustment program, condemning administration benefits to the farmer as a fallacious program of scarcity and attempting to tell the farmer that the abolishment of the present program would result in better prices for his products. In this connection it will interest you to know that there is today in Washington a delegation of more than a thousand farmers from the State of Georgia who have come here to protest the speech of

Governor Talmadge, to express confidence in the President and approval of the administration's farm program.

The task of the A. A. A. has been that of coordinating the efforts of the American farmer to win his way back to a place in the American economy. In the 2 years following March 15, 1933, prices of the seven farm commodities originally named as basic in the Agricultural Adjustment Act—cotton, tobacco, hogs, corn, wheat, rice, and milk—more than doubled. In 1933, \$162,000,000 in rental and benefits were paid to farmers cooperating in the adjustment program, and in 1934, five hundred and fifty-six millions were paid in rental and benefit payments and drought livestock purchases, bringing the total cash income from \$4,328,000,000 in 1932 to \$5,051,000,000 in 1933, and to \$6,090,000,000 in 1934.

Now, what about Georgia?

In 1932 receipts from farm marketings yielded Georgia farmers \$58,311,000, but by 1934 receipts rose to \$95,886,000, and with \$14,215,000 of rental and benefit payments the total returns were \$110,101,000. In other words, Georgia's farm cash income for 1934 represented a gain of 90 percent over their farm cash income of 1932. In addition to this, up to February 1, 1933, Georgia cotton growers had received \$5,060,261 on cotton options held by them, as a result of the 1933 cotton program, and up to the same date Georgia farmers had taken advantage of the cotton loan to borrow \$42,255,149 on 701,072 bales of cotton. What has happened in Georgia is typical of what has happened in every other agricultural State.

The increase in this well-being of the farmer that followed the improvement in farm income just mentioned meant not only that the farmer has been able to buy more of the things he needs than he has for a number of years, but the city workers have in turn profited by the revival of markets due to his purchases.

These are some of the benefits that have flown to the farmer and the country as a direct result of the agricultural program, but still Governor Talmadge says it is all wrong and should not continue, that it is a program of scarcity, that it stagnates business and is hurtful to the farmer. I am unable to see how the farmer is hurt by doubling his income on the same investment and effort. I am sure that Governor Talmadge has no conscious intention of hurting the farmer. He has simply gotten into water that is over his head and rather than call for help he is willing to drown.

The Governor has threatened to campaign the country against the processing tax, but even if he should give up this proposed trip and decide to stay at home he cannot get by with telling the farmers that "the processing tax has stagnated the cotton industry in America and is causing the importation of cotton here every day." The figures on cotton imports for the 7 months ending February 1935 and the comparison with the same 7 months last year happen to be as follows:

Cotton unmanufactured, imports for consumption, by countries of production, for 7 months ending February—

Country of production	1934	1935
	Pounds	Pounds
Mexico.....	680,492	508,869
British West Indies.....	13,107	4,496
Argentina.....	2,737
Brazil.....	1,608
Peru.....	1,578,694	345,050
British India.....	5,576,875	6,995,055
China.....	6,118,838	1,297,123
Netherland India.....	209,726	157,560
British West Africa.....	31,574
Egypt.....	26,530,230	22,950,204
Total.....	40,742,274	32,250,966

Neither can the Governor get by with bewailing that the "thousands of cotton goods and fabrics that were once made in America and shipped to China and Japan are now made in China and Japan and shipped back here to the United States on account of this foolish processing tax", when the cotton farmers know well enough that imported raw cotton pays the same processing tax as domestic cotton when it is made up in an American mill, and when they know equally well that imported cotton textiles pay a compensating tax equal to our domestic processing tax, in addition to the regular tariff.

In addition to this, nothing would be more foolish than shutting out imports of cotton goods from Japan which is but a fraction of 1 percent of domestic production when Japan is the world's best customer for American cotton.

The Governor objects to all activities of the Government that compete with private enterprise. This puts him in opposition to the development of Muscle Shoals and makes him unwittingly a special pleader for the Power Trust and fertilizer combine which for many years succeeded in the killing off all legislation making use of this Government property. It puts him in opposition to the services that this development is intended to render—cheap fertilizer, rural electrification, and cheap power. Take the Government out of business, the Governor demands. Let me ask him what would have become of the distressed farm owners and home owners if the Government had not come to their rescue. He, of course, knows that the insurance companies, building and loan associations, and other lending agencies would own them all by now.

If the Government is in business, it is because business had failed and the country had to be saved. It was business that first obtained security through governmental aid. Big business that 2 years ago came to Washington with hat in hand, now haughtily demands that the recovery program under which it was saved cease, and Governor Talmadge joins in asking that this be done.

In his frenzied attack upon the President, Governor Talmadge has thrown himself into the very arms of big business, for it is from this source that comes greatest objection to the effort being made to give some kind of relief and security to people who toil. I am opposed to the regimentation of business and of life. I believe in government by law and not by men; but a state of war demands war measures, and until we come out of the slump into which the country has fallen we will have to put up with things with which we are unaccustomed. There is no intention anywhere to filch from the people their liberties, but, on the other hand, the determination to make them secure in the enjoyment of all their natural and legal rights.

Governor Talmadge blames the administration for the continued unemployment of thousands of unfortunate people and in the same breath he damns the President for relief activities which are designed to give these unfortunates a temporary means of living until they can be absorbed by industry. He complains of millions of dollars being spent for relief, but he fails to mention the widespread suffering that would result but for this humanitarian policy. He manifests greater concern in the profits of business than in the lives of the people. What would he do for the poor? There is no work to be had and they cannot live on grass.

In denouncing the administration farm program as an effort to build prosperity from scarcity, he fails to refer to the miserable economic conditions prevailing in American agriculture when large surpluses in cotton, wheat, and other major commodities depressed prices to the point where farmers were unable to recover the cost of their operations. In making the false claim that curtailment of acreage put millions of people off the farms, he said nothing of the tremendous increase in farm revenue that has resulted from this acreage curtailment. Perhaps his major recommendation for restoring normal conditions is the laughable suggestion that the Agricultural Adjustment Act be abolished and all outstanding contracts to the farmers be paid off and agriculture be forced to return to the old unorganized status it occupied during the early days of the depression. If this were done, a rule of ruin would follow. Expansion of acreage would be the first step, overproduction would ensue, the Government's policy of making commodity loans would be abandoned, market prices would collapse, and in less than a year American agriculture would find itself back in the depth of despair from which it is just now emerging.

The Governor has apparently overlooked the fact that the problem that confronted the President in 1932 was a complex one. That among other things it involved both recovery and reform. Recovery could have unquestionably been accomplished more speedily had all effort been concentrated upon that single phase of the problem, but the opportunity for reform would have passed, and reform was essential to the general good as recovery.

New treatment for both old and new problems had to be applied, and this called for experimentation which involved error. Errors have, of course, been made. In so vast an undertaking as saving the country from rack and ruin, calling for the speedy setting up of new machinery for administration purposes and the expenditure of huge sums of money, error was inevitable. No reasonable person would have expected such an undertaking to be free of inequalities, injustices, and waste. The question is: Have general conditions improved under the treatment that has been applied?

The Governor would judge things upon the basis of their weaknesses rather than their strength. His demand is for perfection in everything. Because of a lack of infallibility on the part of the President and perfection in the institutions and men set up and appointed to administer governmental affairs, he would hold that the President has been a complete failure and would set him aside and have another elevated to this high station, and the Governor seemingly intended, in this connection, to invite attention to himself.

The controlling passion of the President, as gathered from his public utterances and what he has done, has been to save America, and in the prosecution of this lofty and noble purpose he has probably found it necessary to accept as temporary expedients things that he would oppose being made permanent policies of government. The effort has been to give emphasis to the fact that government is the concern of all, that it is a social union, that it exists not alone for the protection of property but for the protection of person and property and all the good that government can be made to bestow. It is in the light of actualities that we must judge if we hope to judge rightly. The laying down of broad general principles of justice upon which to ground a rule of governmental conduct is not a simple undertaking.

Is it to be understood that the Governor has teased himself into the funny position of bidding for three nominations? A place on the national Democratic ticket, or if that cannot be had then on the Republican ticket, and if that be denied him then a place on the ticket of any third party that may come along? To be a contender for any one of these places a candidate should be able to start out with the support of his own State which in this instance will never be the case, for Georgia has but one candidate for the Presidency in 1936, and that candidate is the President himself.

But as serious as is the political apostasy of the Governor, his most grievous offense was his violation of all laws of decency

and propriety committed in a recent speech in which he derisively referred to the physical infirmities of the President. For this one offense, if for none other, public sentiment should lash him out of public life.

CRITICS OF A. A. A.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the President's denunciation of the critics of his destructive A. A. A. policies as liars includes a very wide category of Democrats and initiates a New Deal Ananias Club, including Senators Glass, Byrd, Tydings, Bailey, George, Walsh, Gore, Copeland, and Long, and Governor Talmadge of Georgia, Bainbridge Colby, former Democratic Secretary of State, Alfred E. Smith, John W. Davis, Albert C. Ritchie, Newton D. Baker and, lastly, Father Coughlin, who has been one of the severest and bitterest critics of the A. A. A. program, and practically all of New England.

One of the main pledges of the new-deal administration was to promote the export of our agricultural products, but instead, because of the half-baked program of the A. A. A., the export of wheat, cotton, pork, and other farm produce has reached a vanishing point.

"Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad." Confused and confounded by the marked swing away from the unsound and socialistic new-deal policies, the President lost his head—and that is the mildest term that can be applied—when he called his critics "liars." The facts are seeping through to the people in spite of the radio barrage of the "new dealers" and honeyed words and sugar-coated phrases of the President in his fireside chats, that the impractical, visionary, and magical schemes of the Wallaces, Tugwells, and Ezekiels to destroy crops, regulate the birth control of pigs, and provide a program of scarcity when there are more than 11,000,000 unemployed and over 20,000,000 Americans on relief, have increased unemployment and lost our world markets for wheat and cotton, formerly our greatest sources of real wealth.

Naturally the cotton farmers, with cotton pegged at 12 cents, have flocked to Washington to applaud the President for temporary benefits, regardless of the fact that they are following the "new deal pied pipers" in a dance of death toward vanishing world markets and ruin and desolation for the South. If the cotton farmers and the South want to commit economic suicide for temporary profit, that is their business, but it does not change the facts by one jot or tittle. Lenin was right when he said that the capitalists would commit suicide for temporary profit, and that applies to the farmers as well. The cotton farmers have already lost over 50 percent of the world markets and will lose the balance to Brazil, Egypt, India, and Soviet Russia within the next 2 years, bringing economic and financial ruin to the South. The wheat export markets have already been lost and we are importing more wheat than we export, and shiploads of oats, corn, and rye are being unloaded in the United States at the present time. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes to reply to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is the President of the whole United States. He is the Democrats' President. He is the Republicans' President. For months he has been working day and night in the interest of the American people. When the President's shoulders are bowed down just now with the great burdens of government, I cannot conceive of the kind of man who will get up on this floor day after day and try to hamstring him. [Applause on Democratic side.] He deserves a little encouragement once in a while, he deserves a little cooperation once in a while, he deserves efforts on both sides of this aisle to help hold up his hands in these trying times.

But the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] has to get up and take his swipe at him; and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has to get up and take his swipe at him; and now the new tentative leader, the tentative candidate for President on the Republican side, Mr. FISH, has got to take his political swipe at the President.

Mr. Speaker, I wish these gentlemen on the other side of the aisle could have attended a banquet at the Mayflower Hotel last night, where 710 farmers from the great State of Texas met to thank and eulogize their President. They did not want anything, they did not come here to demand anything, but they came here merely to thank the Congress and the President for what the Congress and the President have done for them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have been here for 18 years in Congress. This is the first time I have ever heard of the American people being so full of gratitude to their President and to their Congress that they would make a trip of 2,000 miles, at their own expense, to thank their Congress and thank their President and his administration for giving them a square deal.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. It is time this sniping ought to stop; it is time this shooting from ambush ought to stop. Even the people of Potsdam do not appreciate it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my only thought in getting this time is this: After listening to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] make his wonderful appeal to the Membership of the House to stand by and support the President, I am wondering whether or not gentlemen on his side of the aisle are going to support the President in his position on the bonus.

Mr. BLANTON. No, we are not; but that has nothing to do with it, because we are not attacking him and we are not sniping at him all the time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

FRED C. AINSWORTH ENDOWMENT LIBRARY

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the late Gen. Fred C. Ainsworth left a bequest of \$10,000 to establish in Walter Reed Hospital the Fred C. Ainsworth Library. The Judge Advocate General of the Army has held that action by Congress permitting the War Department to accept this money to have the library established is necessary.

Unless acceptance is made by the 5th of June the bequest will fail. It is, therefore, an emergency that we take up and pass this bill.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 98, to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the bequest of the late Maj. Gen. Fred C. Ainsworth for the purpose of establishing a permanent library at the Walter Reed General Hospital to be known as the "Fred C. Ainsworth Endowment Library."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 98, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the adjutant Walter Reed General Hospital be, and is hereby, authorized to accept the bequest of the late Maj. Gen. Fred C. Ainsworth, or such amount thereof as is available, as contained in his last will and testament, and such interest as may have accrued on the funds covered by such bequest, and to receipt therefor on behalf of the United States, and to deposit the funds so received in the Treasury of the United States as a special fund dedicated to the purpose of establishing

a permanent library at the Walter Reed General Hospital, to be known as the "Fred C. Ainsworth Endowment Library", said fund to be subject to disbursement for such purpose upon vouchers submitted by the adjutant Walter Reed General Hospital and to be available until expended: *Provided*, That the Treasurer of the United States, upon the written request of the adjutant Walter Reed General Hospital so to do, is authorized to invest and reinvest any part or all of the corpus of this bequest, as well as any income therefrom, in interest-bearing United States Government bonds, and retain custody thereof, if, in the judgment of the adjutant it will best serve the objects of the bequest: *Provided further*, That the Treasurer of the United States, upon the written request of the adjutant Walter Reed General Hospital so to do, is authorized to dispose of, for cash, any part or all of any bonds in which such funds may be invested, and redeposit the proceeds thereof, as well as all interest received from time to time upon any such bonds, to the credit of such special fund and subject to withdrawal and disbursement and reinvestment, as above provided for: *And provided further*, That the administration, control, and expenditure of this fund and its application to the purposes intended shall be according to the sole discretion of the adjutant Walter Reed General Hospital, and the exercise of his discretion and authority in regard thereto and his decision thereon shall not be subject to question or review except by the Secretary of War and courts of competent jurisdiction.

Sec. 2. The necessary space or a separate room in any building at the Walter Reed General Hospital is authorized to be set aside for the purpose of establishing the said library.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, as I understand, it is necessary to have a resolution of this kind, in order to take advantage of the bequest?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. That is the opinion of the Judge Advocate General, stated to the War Department, and conveyed in a letter from the Secretary of War to the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and a bill of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to extend until April 1, 1936, the provisions of title I of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2357. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to improve the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley; to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes", approved May 18, 1933.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House to sign a duplicate copy of the enrolled bill H. R. 6084.

RESEARCH IN CONNECTION WITH AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7160) to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of co-operative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges.

This is a bill for research and land-grant colleges. It has the unanimous report of the committee. I feel that there is no opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 7160, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, as far as the bill itself is concerned, I do not know that there is any objection to it. I do not see the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, present.

Mr. JONES. I spoke to the gentleman from Kansas about it. He did not know it was coming up just at this time, but he helped prepare the bill and is supporting it. I telephoned his office. He is on his way. I notice there are other members of the committee on the minority side present.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any explanation that should be made in connection with the bill?

Mr. JONES. I will be glad to make any explanation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, is this one of the bills for which the gentleman has requested a rule?

Mr. JONES. No; I have not requested a rule on this. I may have listed it as one of the bills we wanted to take up, but this is the land-grant and research bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman requested a rule on another bill which had a unanimous report, and it was stated there was no objection to it. It was unanimously reported and everybody was for it, but at the hearing before the Rules Committee some objection arose. That is the forestry bill. It is being held up awaiting further explanation.

Mr. JONES. I do not think I listed that bill. I think the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] listed that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Many of these bills that are reported out unanimously by committees develop much controversy before the Rules Committee.

Mr. JONES. That rarely happens in matters reported by our committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am not going to object, but in my opinion this is not the way to enact legislation.

Mr. JONES. I was simply trying to save time for the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SNELL. What is to be the program for today? As I understood it, the Committee on Agriculture had the call.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The committees will be called as soon as the House disposes of business on the Speaker's table.

Mr. JONES. The Foreign Affairs Committee desires to take up several bills.

Mr. SNELL. I understood the Committee on Agriculture had the call.

Mr. JONES. If this bill is passed, we will be out of the way. We will present nothing further today.

Mr. SNELL. And the gentleman's committee will lose its call.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The Foreign Affairs Committee will take up the balance of the day. They have enough bills to take up the balance of the day.

Mr. JONES. The Committee on Foreign Affairs will have the call, and I was trying to save time for them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TRUAX. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture just what this bill provides?

Mr. JONES. This bill provides for two things: It provides for research into problems affecting agriculture, and a search for new markets and new uses. It also provides additional funds for the land-grant colleges.

Mr. TRUAX. Does it involve any additional appropriation?

Mr. JONES. Yes. For the research it involves at the start \$1,000,000 a year, gradually increasing to \$5,000,000. Then it also provides for an additional fund for the land-grant colleges, beginning with an \$8,000,000 annual appropriation and increases to twelve million. I think the gentleman's own State has a land-grant college.

Mr. TRUAX. Yes. That is the reason I am interested. Mr. JONES. It provides additional funds made necessary by reason of the administration of the farm program.

Mr. TRUAX. Can the gentleman enlighten me as to the research work, just what field will be entered?

Mr. JONES. The research will be into basic lines of agriculture. Sixty percent of the research funds will be allocated to the States, to be matched by the States, the research conducted by the States, into problems of marketing and new uses, and laws and principles affecting agriculture generally. Sixty percent of that money will be allocated to the various States, to be matched by the States.

Mr. TRUAX. And it will go to the colleges and experiment stations?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TRUAX. Are those all the agencies that will secure this money?

Mr. JONES. Those are all the agencies that will secure this money that is allocated to the States for the extension service. Then a percentage of the research fund is left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, 20 percent to be spent wherever he sees fit, and 20 percent in regional investigations in various regions.

Mr. TRUAX. I wonder if the gentleman would welcome a suggestion that part of these funds be used for researching more intensely into the cost of production of basic commodities? I think we are all interested in that.

Mr. JONES. The Secretary could do that out of this fund. It covers in a broad way research into the basic laws of production, the quality and improved methods of production, as well as the search for new uses and new markets.

Mr. TRUAX. It could be done?

Mr. JONES. In my judgment it could be done; yes. The Secretary will have discretion in a broad way in the use of these research funds.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the distinguished gentleman from Texas say that it can be done. If we had less professorial research and less professional "bug" hunters on Government pay rolls, it would then be possible to determine each year with great accuracy the farm cost of production of each basic agricultural commodity. This would provide an opportunity for real and lasting service to farmers of untold value. Tell us, without guessing, what it costs to raise a bushel of wheat, a bushel of corn, a hundred pounds of pork, and a hundred pounds of beef; then, and then only, can we expect national legislation by the Congress to guarantee to the farmer that cost plus a reasonable profit.

I always favor adequate appropriations for worth-while projects under the jurisdiction and direction of land-grant colleges. On the other hand, I am opposed to certain types of so-called "research work" conducted in the past under the supervision of the United States Department of Agriculture cooperating with the various experiment stations. I refer to the somewhat abortive attempt made in 1926, 1927, and 1928 to control the European cornborer. At that time millions of dollars were expended by both Federal and State governments.

One of the schemes tried out was an attempt to develop a type of corn that would be immune and act as a repellent to the attacks of the borer. Nearly \$3,000,000 were spent by the United States Department of Agriculture in the purchase of tractors, trucks, plows, oil burners, and other machinery in the vain hope of destroying the borer by mechanical means, quite overlooking or ignoring the fact that the natural flight of the moths when they emerged from the larvae was the most prolific means of spreading the pest and cannot be stopped or controlled by human agencies or mechanical means. Needless to state that these attempts resulted in foredoomed failure.

Recently I received a copy of a speech by a Member of the Senate which listed more than 1,000 positions now held by college graduates in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. I think it is wholly wrong to deny the same opportunities of employment to outstanding and forward-facing farmers simply because they have been denied the advantages of a college education and training. I hope that this

apparent discrimination in favor of the college graduate which penalizes those farmers who have not had the time nor the means to attend college will be corrected in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objections.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the call lies with the Committee on Agriculture today unless the committee waives the call.

Mr. JONES. Yes; but there are a number of bills the Committee on Foreign Affairs desires to dispose of.

Mr. MICHENER. The Frazier-Lemke bill and the gentlemen's own bill, from his own committee affecting agriculture are on the calendar, and the rules of the House provide that on Calendar Wednesday the committee having the call may bring up such bills as the committee has reported out. Has the gentleman's committee taken action to waive its call on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. JONES. No; the gentleman has not taken action to do that. We have a number of important bills on the calendar which are more or less controversial and which could not be finished in 1 day, and we feel there is no use wasting a lot of the time of the House. The gentleman understands that Calendar Wednesday is only for 1 day, and no important controversial bill can be passed in 1 day. There will be requests for rules on those various bills because they are controversial. They will excite a lot of discussion and it would be impossible to pass them in 1 day. It is not our policy to take up a lot of the time of the House in the consideration of controversial measures that could not be passed in a day. They must be brought up in the regular way so they can be finished.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman is going to ask for rules on those bills, of course, that is a better way of bringing them up.

Mr. JONES. We will ask for rules on several bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I

SECTION 1. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to conduct scientific, technical, economic, and other research into basic laws and principles and processes relating to the improvement of the quality of, and the development of, new and improved methods of production of, distribution of, and new and extended uses and markets for, agricultural commodities and by-products and manufactures thereof. Research authorized under this section shall be in addition to research provided for under existing law (but both activities shall be coordinated so far as practicable) and shall be conducted by such agencies of the Department of Agriculture as the Secretary may designate or establish.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is also authorized and directed to encourage research similar to that authorized under section 1 to be conducted by agricultural experiment stations established or which may hereafter be established in pursuance of the act of March 2, 1887, providing for experiment stations, as amended and supplemented, by the allotment and payment as provided in section 5 to States and Territories for the use of such experiment stations of sums appropriated therefor pursuant to this title.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this title there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, and for each of the 4 fiscal years thereafter \$1,000,000 more than the amount authorized for the preceding fiscal year, and \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter. Moneys appropriated in pursuance of this title shall also be available for the purchase and rental of land and the construction of buildings necessary for conducting research provided for in this title, for the equipment and maintenance of such buildings, and for printing and disseminating the results of research. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this title shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, appropriations for research or other activities of the Department of Agriculture and sums appropriated or otherwise made available for agricultural experiment stations.

SEC. 4. Forty percent of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under section 3 shall be available for the purposes of section 1. The sums available for the purposes of section 1 shall be designated as the "Special research fund, Department of Agriculture", and no part of such special fund shall be used for the prosecution of research heretofore instituted or for the prosecution of any new research project except upon approval in writing by the Secretary. One-half of such special research fund shall be used by the Secretary for the establishment and maintenance of research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural regions at places selected by him and for the prosecution, in accordance with section 1, of research at such laboratories.

SEC. 5. (a) Sixty percent of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under section 3 shall be available for the purposes of section 2. The Secretary shall allot, for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, to each State and Territory an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural population of the State or Territory bears to the rural population of all the States and Territories as determined by the last preceding decennial census. No allotment and no payment under any allotment shall be made for any fiscal year in excess of the amount which the State or Territory makes available for such fiscal year out of its own funds for research and for the establishment and maintenance of necessary facilities for the prosecution of such research. If any State or Territory fails to make available for such purposes for any fiscal year a sum equal to the total amount to which it may be entitled for such year, the remainder of such amount shall be withheld by the Secretary. The total amount so withheld may be allotted by the Secretary of Agriculture to the States and Territories which make available for such year an amount equal to that part of the total amount withheld which may be allotted to them by the Secretary of Agriculture, but no such additional allotment to any State or Territory shall exceed the original allotment to such State or Territory for that year by more than 20 percent thereof.

(b) The sums authorized to be allotted to the States and Territories shall be paid annually in quarterly payments on July 1, October 1, January 1, and April 1. Such sums shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury upon warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture in the same manner and subject to the same administrative procedure set forth in the act of March 2, 1887, as amended June 7, 1888.

SEC. 6. As used in this title the term "Territory" means Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this act.

SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

TITLE II

SECTION 21. In order to further develop the cooperative extension system as inaugurated under the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture", approved May 8, 1914 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 341-348), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of paying the expenses of cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics and the necessary printing and distribution of information in connection with the same, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, and for the fiscal year following the first fiscal year for which an appropriation is made in pursuance of the foregoing authorization the additional sum of \$1,000,000, and for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter an additional sum of \$1,000,000 until the total appropriations authorized by this section shall amount to \$12,000,000 annually, the authorization to continue in that amount for each succeeding fiscal year. The sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii in the same manner and subject to the same conditions and limitations as the additional sums appropriated under the act of May 8, 1914, except that (1) the allotments to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii shall be in the proportion that the farm population of each bears to the total farm population of the several States and Hawaii, as determined by the last preceding decennial census, and (2) the several States and Hawaii shall not be required to offset the allotments authorized in this section. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, sums appropriated under such act of May 8, 1914, as amended and supplemented, or sums otherwise appropriated for agricultural extension work. Allotments to any State or Hawaii for any fiscal year from the appropriations herein authorized shall be available for payment to such State or Hawaii only if such State or Hawaii complies, for such fiscal year, with the provisions with reference to offset of appropriations (other than appropriations under this section) for agricultural extension work.

SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States entitled to the benefits of the act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts", approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 301-328; Supp. VII, sec. 304), there are hereby authorized to be ap-

propriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

(a) For the fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$960,000; and

(b) For the fiscal year following the first fiscal year for which an appropriation is made in pursuance of paragraph (a), \$500,000, and for each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter \$500,000 more than the amount authorized to be appropriated for the preceding fiscal year, and for each fiscal year thereafter \$1,500,000. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) shall be paid annually to the several States in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States in the proportion which the total population of each such State bears to the total population of all the States, as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under such act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such act, as amended and supplemented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums under the act entitled "An act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862", approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments. The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 1, beginning in line 5, after the word "conduct", strike out the balance of line 5 and all of lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, and on page 2 all of line 1 to and including the word "thereof" in line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "research into laws and principles underlying basic problems of agriculture in its broadest aspects; research relating to the improvement of the quality of and the development of new and improved methods of production of, distribution of, and new and extended uses and markets for, agricultural commodities and by-products and manufactures thereof; and research relating to the conservation, development, and use of land and water resources for agricultural purposes."

Page 3, line 20, after the figure "1", insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That not to exceed 2 percent of the sums appropriated may be used for the administration of section 5 of this title."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, in view of the brief discussion on the bill just passed, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the cotton farmers are in Washington today and I am delighted that they are here. I wish that every Member from the Northern States and every Member from the Southern States, every Member who grows cotton, every Member who has a textile plant in his district, whether he be from the North or the South, at a big meeting of the Members and the cotton farmers could discuss our whole cotton problem. It is not a problem for the South alone, it is not a problem for the North alone. We need the South and the South needs us.

Those farmers who have their processing taxes know very well that if the northern markets are gone and if the southern mills lose their foreign market that King Cotton will be dethroned.

Mr. Speaker, the Chair realizes that the northern Members who have spoken have not said that the farmers should not be reimbursed for their cotton; they have said that the wheels of the cotton textile industry must turn, that the people must have work.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why there have been the bitter attacks upon New England by the Secretary of Agriculture, by Members of Congress from the South. [Cries from the Democratic side of "Regular order!" "Regular order!"] You know very well, my friends on the Democratic side, that you need us just as we need you. We have cast no aspersions on the South or the southern workers, but many aspersions have been cast upon our manufacturers and upon our New England workers of foreign descent, who are so fine. I am pleading for the whole country, Mr. Speaker, not for just my section.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make an inquiry. I have heard of Democratic Congresses and Republican Congresses, but I now want to ask if I am justified in referring to the present Congress as a piscatorial Congress, since we have a "kingfish" at one end of the building and a "poor fish" at the other end? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FISH. I would like to know if the gentleman who just spoke is a Member of Congress. I have never seen him before. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry, but the Chair will answer the inquiry of the gentleman from New York by saying that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a very prominent and able Member of the House.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will permit, I would say to the gentleman from New York that if he had been present at the sessions of the House attending to his business, as I have been, instead of touring the country maligning the Chief Executive, he would know I am a Member of this House. [Applause.]

OUR BANKING POLICY

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a copy of a request sent to the Congress by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles, Calif., and also a letter from Mr. Siegfried, an economist.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Banking Act of 1935 has been passed by the House and is now under consideration in the Senate. It was my privilege to participate in the debate on the bill, and in closing my remarks I recommended further study of our banking problem on the part of Congress, and not only on the part of Congress but on the part of commerce, agriculture, and industry. It seems that we have been given to theorizing, and the solution of the problem has not been sought on a factual basis. We must marshal the facts if we expect to treat the subject scientifically. Whether the House or Senate performs this service, now or in the future, it is a duty which remains with the Congress.

Only recently Members received at their offices a document containing suggestions for the act from the well-known economist, Mr. Thorwald Siegfried, of Los Angeles, Calif. Accompanying it was an official request from the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles for consideration of his proposal which had for its purpose the embodiment of economic equity.

The request of the supervisors, it will be recalled, was as follows:

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
Los Angeles, Calif.

To the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress:

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles hereby request that due consideration be given the proposal of Mr. Thorwald Siegfried, as presented to the Banking and Currency Com-

mittee of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Mr. Siegfried's known position as economist and author on economic issues of the day is one that the board of supervisors is familiar with. His position in the community is one of long standing and he is looked upon with high regard.

Very truly yours,

MAME B. BEATTY,
Chief Clerk Board of Supervisors.

From Mr. Siegfried has come to me the following letter under date of May 9, 1935:

MAY 9, 1935.

HON. EDWARD A. KENNEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Complimenting you on having said on May 3 (pp. 7186-7187) the only fundamental things that have appeared in the RECORD up to that time on the subject of banking and currency. All the rest is symptomatic, superficial, emotional, speculative; but the bill of exchange, the self-liquidating item monetized by check, is the core of Anglo-Saxon and American superiority in commerce. When more men wake up to that fact we may have truly scientific banking policy, either by voluntary action of intelligent bankers or by legislation.

If your remarks should be reprinted, I should value having a number of copies for distribution, up to several hundred; also of anything more that you say on this line.

I take this opportunity of handing you another, and marked, copy of the broadside on the currency and banking bill, which was sent to you and other Members last week.

Very sincerely yours,

THORWALD SIEGFRIED.

It is to be hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate now or this House at the earliest opportunity sift the fundamentals relating to banking, whereupon there should be no difficulty in establishing a "truly scientific banking policy."

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. McREYNOLDS (when the Committee on Foreign Affairs was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6504) to amend an act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor", and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 11 of the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America and providing compensation therefor", approved February 23, 1931, be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. That all appointments and promotions of Foreign Service officers shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and such officers may be commissioned as diplomatic or consular officers or both: *Provided*, That Foreign Service officers now or hereafter appointed or promoted during a recess of the Senate shall be paid the compensation of the position to which appointed or promoted from the date of such appointment or promotion until the end of the next session of the Senate if they have not theretofore been confirmed by the Senate, or until their rejection by the Senate before the end of its next session: *Provided further*, That if the Senate should reject or fail to confirm the promotion of a Foreign Service officer during the session following the date of such promotion, the Foreign Service officer shall automatically be reinstated in the position from which he was promoted, such reinstatement to be effective, in the event of rejection of the nomination, from the date of rejection; and in the event of failure of the Senate to act on the nomination during the session following a promotion, from the termination of that session: *And provided further*, That all official acts of such officers while serving under diplomatic or consular commissions in the Foreign Service shall be performed under their respective commissions as secretaries or as consular officers."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES COURT FOR CHINA

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7909) to amend the act creating a United States court for China and prescribing the title thereof as amended, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to ask some questions. What is the necessity for creating these additional employees to send to China? I notice that the bill provides that this clerk to be appointed may act for the judge when the judge is not there. My idea is that the judge ought to be there. There are too many officials who go to foreign countries representing the United States Government and do not stay there and attend to their business. They come back home and stay 2 or 3 months, and some spend their time here lecturing around the country. They have been doing this for 20 years. They want somebody to attend to their business while they are gone.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt the wisdom of passing this bill, although I do not like to put my judgment up against the judgment of the gentleman and his committee. The gentleman, the chairman of this committee, is one of the leading Members of the House. I should like to feel that he watches these things and is not going to approve a bill for extra employees unless it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. May I explain the situation to the gentleman. This is the situation in China. We have one district judge and this judge not only has Shanghai, but he also has to go to two or three other places as far separated as Boston is from San Francisco. All rights of American citizens are determined in this court and it is impossible for the judge to stay in Shanghai all the time. When this situation occurs there is no chance for the settlement of litigation of any kind or for the treatment of prisoners even.

Mr. BLANTON. The thought I have in mind goes back to the passage of the Dyer China Trading Act. When they brought that bill up here for consideration, I called attention to just what would happen; that is, we would have so-called "Americans" going over to China and engaging in business in China for their own commercial advantage. The rest of the people of the United States are not interested at all. These people who go over there are there to make money. I called attention to the fact that this Congress would be called upon year after year to appropriate a lot of money to take care of and protect them and the first thing you know their rights would be invaded over there and we would have to spend a lot of money to protect them. And then over my objections, Mr. Dyer passed another bill to exempt these Americans trading in China from paying an income tax. That law should be repealed.

There is no reason in the world why there should be so many Americans in China doing a private business over there so that the United States Government has to furnish courts in China for them and extra officials to take care of their business.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that there are 4,000 American citizens resident in Shanghai. The gentleman must remember that our marines and soldiers are constantly in that territory.

Mr. BLANTON. But their rights are not protected by this court.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Absolutely.

Mr. BLANTON. Their rights are protected by the United States Army and Navy.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. But if they have to be tried they have to go before that court.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman what is the objection to going into Committee of the Whole and considering this matter?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Not in the least.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not care to waste that time. I just want to ask one question. The gentleman stated there are 4,000 Americans doing business in China.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. In Shanghai.

Mr. BLANTON. In China, which includes Shanghai.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Only in Shanghai.

Mr. BLANTON. In what way do they benefit the people of the United States? Our people are not interested in them, or their money-making schemes in China.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts and Mr. TABER demanded the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7909) to amend the act creating a United States court for China and prescribing the title thereof, as amended, with Mr. Houston in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an understanding as to time.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask a question of the gentleman from Tennessee first?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I want an understanding as to the division of time.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman will have 1 hour's time at his disposal.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I hope at the outset that the gentleman from Tennessee or the sponsor of the bill will explain it to the House. This may save a good deal of time.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. All I want to know is what benefit it is to the 125,000,000 people of the United States to have these 4,000 people in China doing business for themselves? How does it benefit our nationals here in the United States?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I may say to the gentleman that his question might be pertinent if we were establishing a court at this time, but the court has already been established years ago. Our citizens are over there. They are going there all the time. They are coming away from there. Many of them live there. It is for their protection that the court has been created, and it is for the purpose of giving a speedy trial to those persons involved in litigation.

Mr. BLANTON. I have this thought in mind. I know of men who have gone down into old Mexico to try to get rich by going in the mining business, in the oil business, or in the cattle business. As soon as they got down there they would get into some trouble they ought not to get into, and then call on the Government to spend a lot of money to protect them when probably they should not be protected.

I have found sometimes when they go down there and do wrong they are not entitled to any protection from this Government and this is going on all over the world. We ought to make American citizens stay out of these foreign countries if they are going to expect the Government to be spending money in their behalf all the time.

Mr. BOYLAN. Does that include Mexico, too?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I notice in the report accompanying this bill there is a letter from the Attorney General.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The Attorney General does not seem to warm up to the feature in the bill that the commissioner is to be appointed by the district judge to act as district judge in his absence, and he suggests there be a special or substitute judge appointed by the President. It seems to me that notwithstanding this suggestion and this recommendation of the Attorney General the committee has brought in a bill which does the very thing which the Attorney General objects to, and I would like to have the chairman explain that situation.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman is in error about that. The gentleman is misconstruing the first section of the bill. The first section of the bill amending section 10

merely applies to the consulate court. We have a consulate court there now and he acts in these matters ex officio as judge, and this is merely authority for the judge to appoint his clerk as the consulate court, and not to act for the judge in the other matters referred to. The consulate court is more like a justice-of-the-peace court in this country, with certain limited jurisdictions. The gentleman has misconstrued the language. This bill was drawn in the Attorney General's office, and this letter came in response to another bill which had been introduced. This bill was substituted for the other bill in conformity with the request of the Attorney General, and there was a unanimous report by the committee.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. This bill does not create a new, all-time salaried office, does it?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Not at all.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. It simply provides that the judge may appoint a local attorney to act in his behalf at a per diem of \$10 when the judge is necessarily absent from Shanghai on business in other parts of the country.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman is correct. It does not create any additional office. We have a judge in China and under present conditions we have also a consulate court. The consulate court, as I stated a moment ago, is more like a justice-of-the-peace court. When the district judge is not there, there is no one available who can take up these matters, and all the rights of Americans are determined in this district court of the United States. The district judge not only has Shanghai, where there are 4,000 Americans, but he has to go to two other places in China to hold court where we have American citizens and where American rights are involved, and these places are as far apart as Boston from San Francisco. This measure is to apply only in the case of an emergency. If the judge is sick, or if the judge wants to take a vacation of 30 days, he cannot take it. When the change was made over there and the new judge was appointed, there was some lapse of time involved and the people had to go without such a court, and when the former district attorney was before the committee he stated that on account of this condition, at times when the judge is in some other place, American citizens are held in jail for months before they can get a trial.

This does not create a new office. This is simply for the purpose of allowing the President to designate someone in an emergency when the judge cannot be there, who is to receive a paltry sum for his services when the judge is absent. Your committee was unanimous in its report.

Mr. FISH. I would ask the gentleman to spread a little of his wisdom to the Members on this side.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I thought the gentleman, being a member of this committee, was converted and needed no further information.

Mr. FISH. I am with the gentleman, but I want the gentleman to give some information to this side.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I think the Members on that side are all with the committee.

Mr. FISH. No; there is a little opposition here.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Tell me the opposition.

Mr. TABER. I have a suggestion to make to the gentleman, if he will bear with me a moment.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. TABER. This bill says, in line 21, page 2:

Such special judge shall receive the same rate of compensation and the same allowances for expenses and transportation when acting outside of Shanghai as are paid and allowed the judge of said court.

The bill does not say he shall be paid only during the time he is acting during the three instances when he is permitted to have such jurisdiction. It seems to me this language could be clarified quite considerably with reference to the compensation of the judge and show that he should only receive the compensation when he is actually serving under

the conditions set out in the three lettered subdivisions of the bill.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I am thoroughly in accord with the gentleman, and if he will draft such an amendment I shall be pleased to support it.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I think the purpose can be accomplished by changing the position of a comma, moving the comma after the word "compensation", in line 22, to line 23, after the word "transportation", making it read:

Such special judge shall receive the same rate of compensation and the same allowances for expenses and transportation, when acting outside of Shanghai, as are paid and allowed the judge of said court.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid it would not.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The Chairman agrees with you, and if you can arrange an amendment I am willing to accept it.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. The suggestion of the gentleman from New York can be accomplished by transposing the words "when acting outside of Shanghai" to the beginning of the paragraph, making it read:

When acting outside of Shanghai such special judge shall receive the same rate of compensation—

And so forth.

Mr. TABER. I think that would accomplish it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that while the judge has jurisdiction over 4,000 people, in reality he will have jurisdiction most of the time over 8,000 because there are a great many sailors and marines placed there?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. That is true. I want to say to the House that the committee does feel that this is a measure of relief that should be granted.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Gladly.

Mr. FISH. Did not the committee a few years ago take up the question of abolishing extraterritorial rights and privileges in China?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. That has been done with reference to other courts. There was a consular court at Shanghai composed of the consuls of our Government and other governments and also China. That court which had jurisdiction in China is now strictly a Chinese court.

Mr. FISH. Has the committee considered the question whether we should have extraterritorial rights in China?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. No; it has not been reached.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman think we should continue it?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. At this time I am not prepared to say.

Mr. FISH. Then why should we pass this bill?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Because we have this situation.

Mr. FISH. Would the gentleman be in favor of legislation to abrogate them?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further demand for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act creating a United States Court for China and prescribing the title thereof", approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 814), as amended, be, and it is hereby, amended by the addition of the following sections:

"Sec. 10. That the judge of the United States Court for China is hereby authorized to appoint, as in the District Courts of the United States and with similar powers and tenure of office, a United States commissioner, who shall in addition to his other duties be judge of the consular court for the district of Shanghai, with all the authority and jurisdiction exercised prior to June 4, 1920, by the vice consul at Shanghai. Said commissioner shall receive for his services as commissioner and judge of said consular court such compensation as may be fixed by the Attorney General, not exceeding \$10 per day for each day of service actually rendered. In the event of a vacancy in the office of said commis-

sioner or the disability or disqualification or absence of said commissioner, the judge of the United States Court for China may appoint the clerk of said court temporarily to perform the duties of commissioner and judge of the consular court for the district of Shanghai without additional compensation therefor.

"Sec. 11. The President may appoint a special judge of the United States Court for China to act temporarily when necessary—

"(a) During the absence of the judge of said court;

"(b) During any period of disability or disqualification, from sickness or otherwise, to discharge his duties; or

"(c) In the event of a vacancy in the office of judge.

"Such special judge shall receive the same rate of compensation, and the same allowances for expenses and transportation when acting outside of Shanghai, as are paid and allowed the judge of said court."

SEC. 2. All laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after the word "court" insert "No compensation shall be paid to said judge except in the actual discharge of his duties provided by this section."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Houston, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7909, to amend the act creating a United States Court for China and prescribing the title thereof, as amended, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted until midnight tonight to file a report and minority views on the bill (H. R. 8052) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF MILITARY MEDICINE AND PHARMACY

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 249, to provide for participation by the United States in the Eighth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy, to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in June 1935, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee calls up House Joint Resolution 249, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$8,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Eighth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; stenographic reporting and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent; traveling expenses; purchase of necessary books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, and maps; stationery, official cards; printing and binding; entertainment; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, to ask some questions of the chairman of the committee. Is not this a junketing bill?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I do not think so.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not the purpose of this to spend \$8,000 on a junket to Brussels for certain medical men in one branch of our Government?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Does the gentleman want me to answer that?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Perhaps the gentleman should have waited for the chairman to explain the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I just want an answer yes or no.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. No; it is not.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid, nevertheless, that it is, after all, a junketing resolution without my friend knowing it, and I am afraid there are some more junkets in some other bills on today's calendar.

Incidentally, it is well known to my colleagues here that I have never been on a junket since I have been in Congress. I have paid my own expenses out of my own pocket every time I have been to a funeral, and every time I have checked up Government projects in different parts of the United States, and not one dollar has the Government ever reimbursed me for it.

Yet in the Washington Times yesterday appeared the following malicious statement:

When the House committee was named to attend the funeral of the late Senator Bronson Cutting, of New Mexico, Representative THOMAS L. BLANTON was selected as a member of the group.

When the committee was first named, it was thought that the services would be held in New Mexico.

Had that been true, BLANTON would have had the opportunity to stop off at Abilene, Tex., his home. And his trip would have been paid for by the taxpayers of the Nation whom he always contends he wants to protect.

When it was announced, however, that services would be held in New York instead of in New Mexico, BLANTON made a long speech asking to be replaced on the committee.

He suggested the appointment of Representative MATTHEW J. MERRITT, of New York.

BLANTON apparently was not interested in a New York trip.

Those of you colleagues who were not then present should look at the RECORD and see the brief request in just a few words I made asking the Speaker to appoint in my place our distinguished colleague, Hon. MATTHEW J. MERRITT, who is Congressman at large from the entire State of New York.

As this funeral was to take place in New York, I felt that honor could be done our deceased friend, the late able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, by having a Representative of the whole State of New York to attend this funeral.

Yet, even on such a subject, Hearst's Washington Times could not forget its spleen and malice against me long enough not to refrain from misrepresenting the facts, and misleading the public about the real facts.

Since I have been a member of the subcommittee which handles and frames the War Department appropriation bill, I have been one of the official visitors to the United States Military Academy, at West Point, and could have had the Government pay all of my expenses to West Point, N. Y., and back every year, yet not one dollar have I had the Government pay out for such purpose. I could have had the Government pay my expenses on a trip to Panama each year to inspect Government property there, for which my committee appropriates, yet not one dollar has this Government ever paid out for me on any trip to Panama. I could have had the Government pay my expenses whenever I have inspected Government property and projects owned by our Military Establishment, yet not one dollar has the Government ever paid out for same.

I have inspected Government property and Government projects in many parts of the United States, but invariably

I have always paid all of the expenses of same out of my own pocket.

Not one junket have I ever taken. Not a single trip have I ever taken at Government expense. I have always paid for my own trips.

Last year I spent quite a large sum of money out of my own pocket checking up Government projects, so that I would have first-hand information about them when our committee is called upon to make large appropriations for same. I could have been reimbursed for all of it by merely filing expense accounts, for there was money already appropriated to cover just such expenses, yet I filed no expense accounts, and did not ask for reimbursement, but paid all of such expenses myself.

And it is an infamous outrage on the part of this Hearst newspaper continually to make these malicious misrepresentations. It is hurting Hearst and not me, for his readers are gradually learning that they cannot depend on anything they see in one of his newspapers.

But, getting back to this measure, has my friend from Tennessee investigated the necessity for spending \$8,000 to have someone attend this medical conference in Brussels?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The committee investigated it very thoroughly.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman think it absolutely necessary?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I think it would be very beneficial. Everyone in this House knows the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], Mr. Speaker, and who knows his record knows that the gentleman is against junkets. The chairman of this committee is against them; but there are certain things in which we feel the Government ought to engage that are very beneficial.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have such confidence in the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], who is the chairman of this committee, and who is close to the Speaker—and I know that the Speaker is not going to permit any junkets if he can help it—that I shall not stand in the way of his bill or delay it any further, although I have not been fully convinced that we could not save this \$8,000 and keep it from going out of the Treasury without injury to our interests.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 11, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The funds made available under this authorization shall be expended under the supervision of the Secretary of State."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR ESTABLISHMENTS AT HELSINGFORS, FINLAND

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 4448, to provide funds for acquisition of a site, erection of buildings, and the furnishing thereof for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States at Helsingfors, Finland, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of further carrying into effect the provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, there is authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the amount authorized by such act, an amount not to exceed \$300,000 for the purpose of acquiring a site, erection of buildings, and the furnishings thereof, for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States at Helsingfors, Finland. Sums appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for the purpose and be subject to the conditions and limitations of the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, if this were not for Finland, I would not be for it. Finland, geographically and financially, is one of the smallest nations, and yet it is the only nation that has had the honesty to pay back to the United States Government its obligations for borrowed money.

I take off my hat to little Finland. It is honest. It is reliable. It is dependable. It is grateful. It has appreciation. It is not an ingrate.

I used to be proud of the fact that my forbears came from England to this country and settled in Virginia. I used to be proud of it; but I am not proud of it any longer. After all this country did for Great Britain in the World War, when she had her back to the wall and France was on her knees, when Italy and Russia had been whipped out of the picture, this country came to their rescue and sent billions of dollars over there, money that was raised at great sacrifice by the American people. We put 4,000,000 men in uniform and sent our men and flag across the waters and saved their civilization. It is an infamous outrage that a great nation like Great Britain and France should disregard their obligations to this country. I have no patience with any ingrate. Talk about balanced budgets! There will be none in England or France until they make proper provision to pay the sacred debts of honor they owe us.

Little Finland, great honor to her! The first foreign country that I visit is going to be Finland. Here is to the health, happiness, and prosperity to Finland. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very proper gesture to a friendly nation, Finland, the only nation that has paid its war debts. I do not know that I can agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in singling out Great Britain for not paying its share of the war debt. I think it is only fair to tell the House that Great Britain has paid a far larger degree of its debt to the United States than any other foreign country except Finland. The money Great Britain paid back was for credit extended or money loaned during the World War. What I object to is the fact that there are a number of nations, and perhaps it is not wise to name them all, that have not even paid back the money that we loaned them after the war was won or after the armistice was signed. That was not the case with Great Britain. I did not take the floor to defend Great Britain or any other nation for not paying the war debts, on the very liberal adjustment made with them by the Congress and the Government of the United States, especially in view of the huge sums they are spending on military and naval armaments.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that if England and France had not defaulted, and had not deliberately refused to provide means to pay the interest on these debts, other countries would have followed suit. When they did default, the other countries followed what they did, and also defaulted. So, after all, that is the reason I blame those two great countries for leading in defaulting.

Mr. FISH. I blame them both, but particularly I blame France for not paying the money we loaned them after the armistice. Now, the joker of the whole situation is this: We have been paid approximately \$2,000,000,000 by our former allies on these debts, most of it by Great Britain, which has paid about \$1,400,000,000. Germany has paid to the Allies approximately \$2,000,000,000 in the way of reparations and indemnities, but the American people have loaned German cities and industrial companies about \$2,500,000,000. So that today Germany is in \$500,000,000, over and above her payment of war reparations and indemnities.

But I did not rise to speak on that issue. I just wanted to join the committee and say that this is a very proper step to take and a worthy tribute of our esteem and friendship for Finland. Finland is one of the poorest nations of the world, but one of the most honorable. Their Members of Congress or the Diet receive less than \$1,000 a year, and their members of Cabinet get approximately \$2,500, and I think their President is paid a salary of \$14,000. Finland

is the only nation which has actually paid in full in accordance with the terms of the debt settlement with the United States. That speaks well for the Finnish people, both in Finland and in the United States. There are no more loyal, industrious, honest, or dependable people in our country than those from Finland. This bill should be passed by a unanimous vote, not only as a tribute to Finland, the one nation that has paid her debts to us, but to the people of Finnish origin in the United States in order to show our appreciation of their native land—honest little Finland.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will be passed by a unanimous vote by the House and in the Senate without any further delay and be enacted into law, and \$300,000 be made immediately available for the purpose of acquiring a site, erection of buildings, and the furnishings thereof for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States at Helsingfors, Finland.

Let me ask this, as long as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is on his feet, what has happened to the \$1,200,000 we appropriated for an embassy in Soviet Russia, which has refused to pay its debts? Can the gentleman enlighten this House on that? What a marked difference there is between Finland, formerly a part of Russia, and the present Soviet Government of Russia.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman from New York is a member of that building commission, and he has the same information as the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FISH. I am inclined to believe that in view of the repudiation of its promises made when we recognized Soviet Russia that no American embassy will be built or ought to be built in Moscow until an agreement is reached to pay or reimburse American citizens for property seized by the Soviet Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has expired.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it is a source of a great deal of pleasure to me that we have this bill before us for consideration, and I feel that the House is for it unanimously. I take some little pride in having originated the idea of providing for the erection of a building in Finland to house our diplomatic and consular activities in that country. I feel that it is a gesture in the right direction to that Nation, small though it be, which has shown loyalty to principle by paying its obligations to this Government. Not only is it a mark of respect we desire to show them but also it is thoroughly justifiable from the facts existing in Helsingfors. The other great nations of the world excepting the United States have creditable buildings in Helsingfors. Our forces, including our Minister, occupy the fifth floor of a store building. We pay nearly \$12,000 per year in rentals. While the pending bill calls for an authorization of \$300,000, our Minister to Finland states that he feels it will cost only \$275,000 for the purchase of the property and the construction of suitable buildings which will be a credit to this Government. So, figured in this way, and considering that it will cost the Government only 2½ or 3 percent to procure this money, we shall have an ultimate saving in our rentals in Helsingfors and at the same time will be showing some honor and respect to that little nation which stands by its own obligations. I am sure every Member of the House will be glad to vote for this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 182, to provide for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History; and to authorize the President to extend an invitation for the next general assembly of the institute to meet in the United States in 1935, and to provide an appropriation

for expenses thereof, and ask unanimous consent that the House joint resolution may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That to enable the United States to become a member of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually the sum of \$10,000 for the payment of the quota of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to extend to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History an invitation to hold the second general assembly of the Institute in the United States in the year 1935;

SEC. 3. That the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of such a meeting, including personal services without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; stenographic reporting and other services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 4, sec. 5); rent, traveling expenses; purchase of necessary books and documents; newspapers and periodicals; stationery; official cards; printing and binding; entertainment; hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger vehicles; and such other expenses as may be actually and necessarily incurred by the Government of the United States by reason of such invitation in the observance of proper courtesies, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation now under consideration, House Joint Resolution 182, has two objectives. First, it provides for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. Second, it authorizes the President to extend an invitation to the Institute to hold its next regular session in Washington, D. C. The bill also authorizes an annual appropriation of \$10,000 to pay the pro rata share of the United States of the expenses of the Institute, and provides further for an appropriation of \$10,000 to defray the expenses incident to the meeting of the Institute here next fall.

For the benefit of the House I will undertake to give a brief history of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. It was created by a resolution of the Sixth International Conference of American States in Habana, Cuba, on February 7, 1928. Article 8 of the resolution provides:

The seat of the institute shall be the capital of any American state chosen by the Pan American Union. The Government of the American state which accepts the locating of the institute in its capital shall provide a building appropriate for the labors hereinbefore enunciated which it must perform.

The governing board of the Pan American Union, after mature consideration, designated Mexico City as the seat of the institute. The Mexican Government having accepted the location has provided at its own expense a suitable and commodious building for its accommodation. On September 16, 1929, representatives from 19 American nations met in the national palace in the city of Mexico for the purpose of organization. The United States was represented at the meeting by Col. Lawrence Martin, Chief Division of Maps, Library of Congress; Prof. George B. Winton, professor of history, Vanderbilt University; and Dr. William Bowie, Chief Division of Geodesy, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, all having been appointed as delegates by the President.

The budget, accepted at this preliminary assembly, contemplated an annual expenditure of \$52,000 with the part to be borne by the United States fixed at \$31,750. At the first regular assembly of the institute, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1932, the total annual budget was reduced to \$27,900, and the part to be borne by the United States was reduced to \$10,000.

At the meeting in Rio de Janeiro the United States was represented by Hon. Edwin V. Morgan, Ambassador to Brazil, and Dr. Wallace W. Atwood, president of Clark University, Worcester, Mass. The assembly selected Dr. Atwood as executive president for the succeeding 3 years and Washington as the next place of meeting.

In a communication from Hon. Wilbur J. Carr, Assistant Secretary of State, to Hon. KEY PITTMAN, Chairman of the

Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, on June 7, 1934, the objectives of the institute were enumerated as follows:

The purpose of the institute should be to serve for the coordination, distribution, and publication of geographical and historical studies in the American States and to serve as an organ of cooperation between the geographical and historical institutes of America in order to facilitate the study of the publications which concern geography and history and to initiate and coordinate investigations which require the cooperation of several countries and to direct scientific discussion.

Topographic and geodetic maps, prepared under the supervision of this institute may be most helpful to the various American countries in the development of their natural resources. The data prepared by such agency might also be found most advantageous in promoting transportation facilities, including railroads, motor vehicles, and airplanes. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It was the intention of the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], that the gentleman from Georgia should have 30 minutes in the Committee of the Whole to make his speech; and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may have an additional 25 minutes in which to finish his speech, which is the time he would have had in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Speaker, the institute is essentially of a nonpartisan nature, but its services might become available where matters of dispute over border lines and kindred questions arise between American nations in the event that each government concerned might make specific request for such services upon the part of the agency.

In referring to the pending bill, Dr. Wallace W. Atwood, president of the institute, had the following to say:

As I mingle with the Latin-American people I realize more strongly each year that we must establish cordial cultural relations with them. They appreciate those finer things in life and they are much interested in coming to know us in other than commercial ways.

Our Washington meeting should do much to help strengthen the spirit of cordial good will and respect. In the end I believe it will aid greatly in promoting commercial relations.

In addition to the recommendation of Secretary Hull to our Foreign Affairs Committee of the House regarding the bill, I have a personal message from him, in part as follows:

From a scientific and educational point of view the aims of the institute are very commendable and the active participation of this Government will greatly enhance the effectiveness of the institute's work. I believe that this Pan American organ would ultimately prove of great value to many branches of the Government, scientific organizations, and educational institutions in the United States. * * * In my opinion the Pan American Institute of Geography and History is a worthy endeavor and I am convinced that its support by the United States would be received with great satisfaction by the other American nations.

A message from the President to the Congress, under date of February 20, 1935, is as follows:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State, with an accompanying paper, to the end that legislation may be enacted providing for an annual appropriation of \$10,000 for the payment of the share of this Government in the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and requesting the President to invite the Pan American Institute of Geography and History to hold its second general assembly in the United States in 1935, and providing an appropriation of \$10,000 for the expenses of such a meeting.

If by joining our efforts with those of our sister Republics to the south we can promote a closer relationship and a more thorough accord in the solution of our mutual problems, the civic, social, and commercial splendor of a new era for this hemisphere is assured. So in response to the expressed wishes of all our scientific organizations, and upon the request of the Secretary of State and our President, let us now pass, without further delay, this worth-while legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION AT BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, 1935

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 210 for the participation of the United States in a universal and international exhibition at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up House Joint Resolution 210 of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 73]

Amlie	DeRouen	Kennedy, N. Y.	Rich
Andrews, N. Y.	Dirksen	Kerr	Richards
Bankhead	Drewry	Kimball	Robertson
Berlin	Driver	Kopplemann	Ryan
Bland	Duncan	Lamneck	Sabath
Brennan	Dunn, Miss.	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, La.
Buckley, N. Y.	Eaton	Lee, Okla.	Scott
Burnham	Flannagan	Lloyd	Scrugham
Cannon, Wis.	Gambrill	McClellan	Sears
Carden	Gasque	McFarlane	Shannon
Carlson	Gifford	McGehee	Short
Casey	Gildea	McLaughlin	Smith, W. Va.
Chapman	Gillette	Millard	Snyder
Claiborne	Goldborough	Miller	Stubbs
Clark, Idaho	Gray, Pa.	Mitchell, Ill.	Sullivan
Cochran	Green	Montet	Sumners, Tex.
Collins	Greenwood	Nichols	Sutphin
Connery	Hancock, N. C.	Oliver	Sweeney
Cooley	Hartley	O'Malley	Thomas
Corning	Hennings	Peyser	Treadway
Cox	Hook	Pfeifer	Wadsworth
Cross, Tex.	Hope	Randolph	Waiter
Culkin	Keller	Reece	Werner
Dear	Kennedy, Md.	Reilly	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-six Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOME MORTGAGE RELIEF

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6021) to provide additional home-mortgage relief, to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION AT BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, 1935

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 210), for the participation of the United States in a universal and international exhibition at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935, with Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, there are some Members on this side of the aisle who want the joint resolution read; therefore I must object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the invitation extended by the Belgian Government to the United States to participate in a universal and international exhibition to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935 is hereby accepted.

Sec. 2. The President is authorized to appoint a commissioner general to represent the United States in the exhibition. The commissioner general shall prescribe the duties of the commissioner and shall, under the direction of the Secretary of State, (1) make all needful rules and regulations relative to the exhibits from this country and its overseas territories, and for the expenditures incident to the installation of such exhibits, and for the preparation of reports of the exposition and the general results thereof; (2) furnish such information to private exhibitors and prospective exhibitors as he may deem requisite and feasible; (3) make all proper arrangements for the preparation, transportation, installation, display, and care of the exhibits from this country and its overseas territories; (4) with reference to such exhibits from this country and its overseas territories, and reports, cooperate with and secure the assistance of the various executive departments and branches of the Government participating in the exposition, which departments and branches may, with the approval of the Secretary of State, designate officials or employees of their departments or branches to assist the commissioner general, but no such official or employee so designated shall receive a salary in excess of the amount which he has been receiving in the department or branch where employed, plus such reasonable additional allowance for expenses as may be deemed proper by the Secretary of State; (5) employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as may be necessary, and fix their reasonable compensation; and (6) purchase such material, contract for such labor and services, and cause to be constructed such buildings as may be necessary to carry out the general purpose of this act. The heads of the various departments and branches of the Government are authorized, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, to collect and prepare suitable exhibits for display at the exposition, accompanied by appropriate descriptions in the French, Flemish, and English languages.

Sec. 3. Officers and employees of the executive departments or branches of the Government in charge of or responsible for the safekeeping of any property of this country and its overseas territories which is proposed to be exhibited, may permit such property, on the request of the commissioner general, to pass from their possession for the purpose of being transported to and from and exhibited at the exposition. At the close of the exhibition, or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, if practicable, the commissioner general shall cause all such property to be returned to the respective departments and branches from which taken; and if the return of any such property is not practicable, he may, with the knowledge of the department or branch from which it was taken, and with the approval of the Secretary of State, make such disposition thereof as he may deem advisable and account therefor.

Sec. 4. In order to defray the expenses hereinbefore specified and all the singular expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, the sum of \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended. All expenditures shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of State and payable upon his certification, but shall not be subject to the provisions of any law other than this act regulating or limiting the expenditure of public money, but this provision shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit or permit any indebtedness to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated.

Sec. 5. The commissioner general, with the approval of the Secretary of State, may receive from any source contributions to aid in carrying out the general purpose of this act, but the same shall be expended and accounted for in the same manner as any appropriation which may be made under authority of this act. The commissioner general is also authorized to receive contributions of material to aid in carrying out the general purpose of this act, and at the close of the exposition or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, under the direction of the Secretary of State, shall dispose of any such portion thereof as may be unused.

Sec. 6. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to transmit to Congress within 6 months after the close of the exposition a detailed statement of all expenditures, together with the reports hereinbefore specified and such other reports as he may deem proper which reports shall be prepared and arranged with a view to concise statement and convenient reference.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, of all the bills introduced in the Congress of the United States on expositions, I think this bill is unique. In the first place, it does not authorize an appropriation for any junket. I heard someone a few moments ago say that this is only a junket bill involving \$25,000. If the Members will read the bill they will find there are no salaries paid to any commission, which is rather unusual. It merely provides for the United States to participate in the exposition to be held in Belgium.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman will read paragraph 5, line 21, of page 2 for the benefit of the Members of the House?

Mr. BLOOM (reading):

(5) Employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as may be necessary.

Now, what is the question?

Mr. TABER. I thought the Committee might be interested in knowing that the money could be used to employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants that may be necessary, and their reasonable compensation may be fixed.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; the gentleman is correct; but it is not a junket for the reason that only applies to the different departments who may send clerks over. There is a commissioner general provided for, who will be our Ambassador to Belgium, Mr. Morris. He is to act as the commissioner general, and the Ambassador has graciously offered to contribute the time necessary to make our part of it a success.

Mr. Chairman, the only reason these expositions are held is for the benefit of trade. That is why we participate and that is why we hold expositions.

Now, let us see what has happened to our export business to Belgium. In 1929 our exports were \$114,855,000. In 1930 they dwindled to \$86,000,000 and in 1931 they went down to \$59,441,000. In 1932 the exports were \$40,278,000. In 1933 they were \$43,268,000 and in 1934, \$49,814,000. The balance of trade in favor of the United States has gone from \$40,807,000 to \$23,640,000.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Has the gentleman any figures indicating what the balance of trade was before the war?

Mr. BLOOM. I have not those figures before me at this time.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I was wondering to what extent the favorable balance during the latter part of the decade of 1920 was due to the loans that were extended to European countries, and whether the dropping off in part represents only the cessation of credit?

Mr. BLOOM. Unfortunately, I have not the information before me, and I do not want to say anything or give any answer unless I am sure of my figures. I may say, however, that one of the principal reasons our export trade has dwindled down is because we keep on insulting the different peoples of the world. On the floor of this House there is always an exception to participating in friendly expositions, and you cannot expect to hold your world trade or increase your trade unless you are friendly and honest in your expressions of thought. That is a fact.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I want to assure the gentleman that was not my intention in asking the gentleman the question I did; however, I would like to know if somebody can give the information as to what part of this trade with foreign countries, especially with Belgium, during the latter part of the twenties was due to the credit that we extended to them and such artificial devices as that?

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman that I might have this information in my office. I did not think that question was going to be brought up here today. I will be very glad to insert the information in the RECORD.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that our export trade had dwindled to nearly nothing?

Mr. BLOOM. I did not say that.

Mr. SNELL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that a few minutes ago?

Mr. BLOOM. Our exports in general have gone down.

Mr. SNELL. Did the gentleman say they had dwindled to nearly nothing?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Will you give that information to my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], because yesterday I made a statement not nearly as broad as that and he disputed me. If you will give the gentleman

that information to put in his speech it will make a much better speech.

Mr. BLOOM. I would like to give the gentleman some information. Is the gentleman willing to receive some information along this line?

Mr. SNELL. Surely.

Mr. BLOOM. If our export trade, which was \$114,855,000 in 1929, dwindled to \$43,000,000, I would like to have the gentleman give the reason for it.

Mr. SNELL. I will give the gentleman some of the reasons if he will give me the time.

Mr. BLOOM. I will give the gentleman time, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. SNELL. I spent about an hour day before yesterday giving some of the reasons our export trade had gone all to pieces, and my friend O'CONNOR said my statements were not correct, but the gentleman has now fortified me in the statements I then made.

Mr. BLOOM. I can assure the gentleman that the argument of the gentleman should go to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], and not to me. This is a different kind of argument.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman was speaking about trade balances?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman has seen the report of Mr. Peek, and if so, how he reconciles his statement with that report.

Mr. BLOOM. I will say to the gentleman I am going to stick to this Brussels exposition, and we are not going to get into an argument here that will take up the entire hour. I have enough trouble right here now, I admit. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. LEHLBACH. While the gentleman is giving us foreign-trade figures as between the United States and Belgium, will he not give us the figures showing how much our exports to Belgium have increased as a result of the trade agreement recently entered into?

Mr. BLOOM. With respect to the question the gentleman has just asked, in the first place, sufficient time has not elapsed to really give any figures or to find out how beneficial it will be, but to give you an idea of the friendly feeling between the two countries, and I am only speaking of Belgium now, this is an order of May 13, 1935, which is pretty close.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The gentleman is going to refer to lard.

Mr. BLOOM. How well the gentleman anticipates. I am going to refer to lard, and the gentleman already knows about it. Do not conceal the good things entirely, but bring them out; and for the benefit of the entire committee I would like to illustrate the friendly feeling between Belgium and the United States.

This is dated May 13, 1935:

The Belgian Ambassador informed the State Department today that his Government had decided to reduce the import license tax on lard from 100 francs per hundred kilos to 50 francs per 100 kilos. This action was voluntary on the part of the Belgian Government, for which no return concession was demanded.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I will yield in just a moment.

By the terms of the trade agreement between the United States and Belgium, which becomes effective on May 1, Belgium had already granted a generous quota on American lard. This proposed 50-percent reduction in the import license tax will be of benefit to hog producers, since the United States exports of lard to Belgium were 15,617,835 pounds in 1933. The reduction will bring the import charges into Belgium on United States lard down to approximately three-fourths of a cent per pound.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is simply a business proposition. Belgium, at the lowest ebb of exports, bought from us

\$43,268,000 worth of goods in 1 year. In 1929 it was \$114,855,000, and this order was entered just a few days ago and shows the friendly feeling between Belgium and the United States.

You are now asked to authorize an appropriation of \$25,000 just to show that the United States wants to participate and join with Belgium and be represented at the exposition there this year.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KENNEY. Will the Commissioner General report to the Congress on our participation in this exposition?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Let me explain to you just what this means. When this bill first came up we were economizing in every way, and we knew we could not get an appropriation of \$250,000 or \$300,000, which is the sum usually appropriated for such purposes. Just the other day we appropriated \$350,000 for the exposition in San Diego, which was a small sum for such an exposition. It should have been more.

We should be represented in Belgium and this bill only provides for the representative of our Government over there, so that he may participate in the various meetings that take place in connection with the representatives from the different countries of the world. This is all that it amounts to and it is not a junket. Even if we spent the entire \$25,000, which I do not think we can the way we are going to participate, we would not be spending very much.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. This is May 15, 1935. The Senate of the United States has passed on only a very few of the supply bills, and on only a few of the other major bills. It has all that legislation before it to pass upon and the exposition is now almost over in Belgium.

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. BLANTON. It is almost over, and does not the gentleman from New York know that before you could get this kind of bill through the Senate and passed there, by setting aside all the major legislation we are trying to get through over there, the summer would be over.

Mr. BLOOM. No; this appropriation will be in the next deficiency bill if this House passes it. There is nothing to the whole matter except \$25,000.

Mr. BLANTON. The sum of \$25,000 should not be wasted, and is worth saving. The House Appropriations Committee has passed every one of the supply bills.

Mr. BLOOM. But you have a deficiency bill pending now.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the last one to come up before our adjournment sine die.

Mr. BLOOM. That is time enough.

Mr. BLANTON. That will be about the first of July.

Mr. BLOOM. If you will pass this appropriation—give it to the Government—

Mr. BLANTON. If they give it to the gentleman he will find some way of spending it I know.

Mr. BLOOM. That is all right, but you just authorize it under this bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. How much did Belgium give or appropriate for the exposition at Chicago?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know, but I will say that that was one of the finest exhibitions at the Chicago exposition. We are asking other countries to participate in our expositions. We have two bills here asking them to participate in expositions, one of them in Texas next year. You cannot expect people to come over here and participate in our expositions, spend more money than we spend, it would not be right to ask them to come here all the time and we not participate in their expositions.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The Texas centennial that comes off next year is not for the benefit of foreign nations. It is for

the benefit of American citizens. It is the one State in this Union that has been a republic of itself. It has had its own flag.

Mr. BLOOM. Six flags.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; under six flags. It has been of tremendous benefit to the United States, not only to the great State of Texas but to the whole country, by causing the acquisition of much valuable territory to the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman from New York is a good judge of these matters, and looking at it not from a political standpoint but from sound economic principles, does not the gentleman think that this investment of \$25,000 to participate in the Belgium exposition will be profitable to this country?

Mr. BLOOM. There is no question about it; but I do not look at it from that standpoint, for this reason: We should do something, and we do not want it to appear as if \$25,000 was for real participation. If we participated in that exposition the way they participated in our exposition at Chicago, it would cost 10 times as much. But, as I said at the beginning, our Ambassador in Belgium has graciously consented to see that our representation abroad will be such that we will not be ashamed of it. It is necessary for us to delegate someone over there as commissioner general to represent the United States. That is why this resolution is brought on the floor today.

Mr. LUCKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. LUCKEY. Was not the Belgium exhibition in Chicago financed by private concerns?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. I am glad the gentleman asked that question; that is what this bill provides for.

Mr. LUCKEY. You authorize an appropriation of \$25,000.

Mr. BLOOM. We have to have something to start in on and we could not make it any less.

Mr. LUCKEY. I think that this is another one of those junkets.

Mr. BLOOM. You cannot have much of a junket on \$25,000 for participation in an exposition.

Mr. FIESINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Certainly.

Mr. FIESINGER. How are you going to house this thing over there?

Mr. BLOOM. Whatever we have there we have to pay out of this \$25,000. We are permitted to take donations.

Mr. FIESINGER. You will have to have some kind of housing?

Mr. BLOOM. No, not necessarily; they will furnish us space.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Here are the facts. This invitation was extended to the United States by Belgium in 1927.

Mr. BLOOM. Right.

Mr. BLANTON. That was 8 years ago.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. And the Cabinet discussed it at a meeting in 1933, 2 years ago.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And turned it down, did they not?

Mr. BLOOM. Not exactly turned it down. They did not approve of it.

Mr. BLANTON. They disapproved of it.

Mr. BLOOM. For what reason?

Mr. BLANTON. Disapproval is turning it down, is it not?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. I would say so. I think disapproving it means turning it down.

Mr. BLOOM. As Al Smith would say, "Let us look at the record."

Mr. BLANTON. I compliment my distinguished friend from New York upon his pertinacity.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; not that. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. For not taking "no" from the Department, because he has gone back to them again and again, and finally has gotten them to agree not to disapprove it.

Mr. BLOOM. Let us look at this. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] says so many nice things about me that I think that last word, pertinacity, is something terrible. [Laughter.]

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the Department really did approve it.

Mr. BLOOM. Do you want me to read it to you?

Mr. TABER. Yes; if it did.

Mr. BLOOM. I did not say approve and I did not say they did not turn it down, but just let me read this to you, and this is from Secretary Hull:

I wish to reiterate, however, that considering the matter from the standpoint of the friendly relations existing between Belgium and the United States, there will be no objection to the passage of this resolution.

Mr. TABER rose.

Mr. BLOOM. Please wait a minute. This is one time that I do not want to yield. I leave it to the committee whether that is complete disapproval of this resolution. It is not. The gentleman from Texas spoke about this coming up in 1927. We have today two resolutions that invite the nations of the world to participate in the San Francisco exposition and in the San Diego exposition, I think in 1938. I do not know whether the resolutions have passed regarding the holding of an exposition in 1938. From 1927 to 1933 of course nothing was done. It did not come before any of the committees. They just had this invitation, and let it stay there. In 1933 they brought it up and said they could not appropriate any money at that time, because they did not have the money or did not want to spend it for that purpose, but Secretary Roper thought that he could raise the money from the outside. So we say that with this \$25,000 we can participate, and I sincerely hope the committee will act favorably on this resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us when this exposition opens.

Mr. BLOOM. It has not opened yet.

Mr. TABER. When does it open?

Mr. BLOOM. I think I could tell you in a moment.

Mr. MICHENER. The lady here says that it opened last February and is just about through. Is that correct?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no. Perhaps on the Republican side that is so, but we still go by the calendar on this side. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, let us get the facts straightened out first.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Has the gentleman any idea who is going to be the Commissioner General under this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not know of a man whom I would prefer more than my good friend from New York [Mr. Bloom]. [Applause.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I agree with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. He made such a valuable commissioner for the George Washington Centennial that I do not believe you could get a better one anywhere.

Here are the facts. I have here a copy of a letter from the Department. I want my colleagues to remember that foreign countries deal with our country through our State Department. Our State Department handles all business for this Government with foreign governments and when our Government wants to participate in some exposition abroad, the request comes from the State Department to the Congress asking us to let them make an exhibit, and asking us

for the money. No such request has come from the Department. The request comes from our good friend from New York, Sol Bloom. That is the reason I was complimenting him on his pertinacity. He would not give up. Listen to this letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 28, 1935.

HON. SAM D. McREYNOLDS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR JUDGE McREYNOLDS: Hon. SOL BLOOM has requested me to submit a report on House Joint Resolution No. 210 providing for the participation of the United States in a universal and international exhibition to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935.

In a letter of March 6, 1935, I gave you a résumé of the steps taken subsequent to the receipt of the formal invitation from the Belgian Ambassador to the Government of the United States to be represented at the exposition, including a review of a previous letter dated June 16, 1934, and a statement of developments subsequent to that date. The pertinent parts of the letter of June 16, 1934, are as follows:

"The invitation was received in a note from the Belgian Ambassador dated January 22, 1927.

That was 8 years ago—

and since this time the Department has been in correspondence with the other interested departments with a view to deciding definitely whether the invitation should be accepted.

Now comes the main part of it:

As time passed, however, and it became desirable to make some definitive reply to the Belgian Ambassador, the matter was discussed at a meeting of the Cabinet held on November 17, 1933. The question of requesting Congress for a suitable appropriation to defray the expenses of American participation at the exposition came up for discussion but was not favorably considered.

They turned it down, but still it comes up. It is like Banquo's ghost. The gentleman from New York just kept after them, and finally the Secretary of State said, "Well, Sol, if you are going to worry the life out of me, go on and pass your bill and I will not raise any objection to it." There is the situation. It does not come from the Department of State, it does not come from the Secretary of State, it does not come from the Government of the United States, but through the Secretary of State it comes from the Honorable SOL BLOOM, and he says it in this letter which I have just read.

Now, let us see about the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. BLOOM. Why does the gentleman stop reading there? There are many more words after that.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the rest of that is what the gentleman from New York forced him to do. The gentleman forces me to do many things, I like him so well. He gets down close to you and you cannot turn him down. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman read about three more lines?

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. The gentleman will vote for the bill, will he not?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to save this \$25,000. I am going to try to kill it, if I can, but want to kill it without pain and give it a decent burial. I want to kill it by an opiate that will not cause any pain. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman please read the other three lines?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute I will.

Now, the gentleman from New York told you emphatically that this was not a junket, did he not? He said there could not be any junket under this bill. The gentleman is not a lawyer; he is a contractor. If he were a lawyer, he would know there could be a junket under this bill. The language is plain and I want to read it—

Which Departments—

That is, our Departments of Commerce and State down here—

may, with the approval of the Secretary of State, designate officials or employees of their Departments or branches to assist the

Commissioner General, but no such official or employee so designated shall receive a salary in excess of the amount which he has been receiving in the Department or branch thus employed.

Now, they employ a Commissioner General, who will be our good friend, Sol Bloom. He cannot draw a salary more than his \$10,000 salary, that is true; but he can draw his expenses, which means the expense of himself and his retinue of servants that he will take over there with him, because he could not travel without servants. He must have his valet [laughter] to help him put on the right colored necktie in the morning and to have the proper silk trousers shortened to the knee in the evening. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Now, let us see the next provision in the bill:

Plus such reasonable additional allowance for expenses as may be deemed proper by the Secretary of State.

The Secretary of State could allow them round-trip transportation and a per diem of \$15, \$20, \$30, \$40, or \$50 a day if he wanted to. There is nothing in this bill to stop him. Just what he says shall be allowed will be allowed under this bill, because the gentleman from New York has so written it. Now, that is the way this \$25,000 is going to be frittered away.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman has every confidence in the world in our Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, has he not?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I did when he turned this \$25,000 bill down.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman said he was going to try to kill the bill; but he should not try to murder it.

Mr. BLANTON. No. I am going to give it a sleeping potion, which will be just as deadly.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, I do not know; but permit me to say this: The gentleman knows that that could not happen under the present rules and regulations of any Department.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say frankly if they are going to send anybody over there I want to see the gentleman from New York sent. I think he will do us more good than anybody else. But this is no time to be wasting \$25,000 on an exhibition that is half over. That exhibition is going on right now. The gentleman will not deny that. It takes a long time to get up an exhibit. This is May 15, 1935. This bill has to go to the Senate and either displace some other important legislation or await its turn. How does the gentleman expect to have it passed over there and get it into law and set up an exhibition before this summer is over? The Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull and the Roosevelt Cabinet did right in 1933 when they met and considered this matter and turned down this invitation that was extended back in 1927.

Now, what are you going to do with a thing like this? What is this good business man here [Mr. MERRITT of Connecticut] who is one of the wisest business men on the Republican side of the House going to do? He is going to turn it down just as Secretary Hull did. I am such a friend of this administration that I am going to follow Secretary Hull and the Cabinet and try to save this \$25,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman desire some more time?

Mr. BLANTON. I would like about 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman tell us about the manicure? I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I would not want Sol to go over there unless he was properly manicured [laughter]; and he will be. There is nothing that any of you society men do that he will not do over there. Sol, help us beat this bill. It ought not to pass. We ought to save this \$25,000. The people back home need it.

Mr. BLOOM. I will say to the gentleman that after listening to him attack the bill I know he has left such a good im-

pression that the bill is going to pass unanimously, and the gentleman himself is going to vote for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad my friend is optimistic, but he certainly has a great disappointment awaiting him, because we are not going to let this \$25,000 bill pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I thought I was going to be able to get through the day without taking the floor to put up a fight against some of these bills which the Committee on Foreign Affairs brought out. I restrained myself with considerable difficulty on the last bill that was considered, because I believe that bill really ought not to have passed in the shape it was presented.

One other bill providing for about \$10,000 was a severe strain on my good nature. The pending bill is brought before us without any hearings or statement whatever that would justify anybody in voting for it.

As I understand the situation it is something like this, and it seems to be undisputed: The Belgian Government decided on this exposition way back 8 years ago.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is going to ask unanimous consent to withdraw this bill from consideration. I take it the gentleman will not object.

Mr. TABER. I cannot object to that.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 210, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw House Joint Resolution 210 for the participation of the United States in a universal and international exhibition at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935 from consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF AERIAL LEGAL EXPERTS

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6673) to provide for an annual appropriation to meet the share of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee on Aerial Legal Experts and for participation in the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and the commissions established by that Committee, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill ought to be explained. I object.

The SPEAKER. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the Committee resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6673, with Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill contains two authorizations; the first is to take care of the dues of this country in the aerial legal congress, the second is to pay the expenses of the delegates who attend.

The purpose of this conference is to establish international laws on aviation and aviation rights. Experts are appointed by the different countries participating. At the present time 33 countries participate in this congress. The annual dues for each and every country, whether it be large or small, is 1,000 gold francs. It will be noticed that the first part of this bill is rather unusual. It authorizes an annual appropriation to pay the pro rata share of the United States in the expense of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts. Our fixed dues under the authorization of 1931 are \$250, equal to the 1,000 gold francs.

The dues, as I stated, are the same for small countries as for large countries. This is unusual because in conferences of this kind, as a rule, the larger countries are taxed more than the smaller countries. The reason this provision is worded in this way is on account of the exchange, and you can see very readily why it is done. The dues, however, are 1,000 gold francs plus whatever the exchange may be; and this is the reason for the provision being drafted as it is.

We have been a member of this convention for some time, but have never sent any delegates to it at the expense of the Government. There have been people in this country who were so interested in trying to establish the aerial law of the world that they have gone at their own expense.

Two regular conferences have been held, one in Warsaw in 1929 and one in Brussels in 1933. This country was not represented at the Warsaw conference. At the 1929 conference the countries participating agreed on certain principles which they thought should be adopted as the law affecting certain aerial subjects. While we were not represented, yet when that memorandum or agreement was brought to this country it was ratified by our Senate and we became a party thereto. In the 1933 conference at Brussels, Mr. Cooper, an attorney from Jacksonville, Fla., was present at his own expense. Certain recommendations were made in that conference.

Nothing done at this international congress is binding on this country until ratified by the Senate, but I am sure the Members of the House can see the reason and the necessity for uniform aerial laws. For instance, we are close to South America, and our machines are flying over South American countries almost daily. There should be some uniformity of the laws in those countries controlling the rights to fly, license requirements, insurance requirements, and relating to the settlement of damages which may occur. Since the perfection and use of this modern means of transportation these matters become of the utmost importance not only in the Americas but also in Europe, where our people flying as passengers in European planes would be affected and where even our own planes sometimes fly.

If these laws are to be established as international laws wherein the people of the United States are so vitally interested is it not proper that we grant the small authorization here sought with this authorization granted we may send our representatives to these congresses to help formulate these laws?

We have a group of four men known as "commissioners", aerial experts, who are appointed by the State Department as members of a commission. They meet twice a year, in the spring and in the fall, and the general conference meets after their report.

The Department of Commerce recommends the pending bill and asks its passage. This, too, is the attitude and request of the State Department.

In this bill we ask only for an authorization of \$6,500 to guarantee that we shall have delegates at the next conference which meets in Lisbon.

I trust there will be no opposition to this bill. I feel that it is to the great interest of the public of the United States that we be in on the ground floor and have a voice in formu-

lating these laws, just as we have had in the formulation of the maritime laws operating throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished chairman of the committee that this proposal is sound, logical, and constructive. There is no real reason why we should not send delegates over to this conference in order to know what is going on and to help codify aviation laws. Certainly we cannot lose anything by it, and, on the other hand, may gain a great deal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from New York, the watchdog of the Treasury [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have not any doubt but what we need representation at this conference, but why we should need \$6,500 to send a good lawyer from the Attorney General's office is beyond me. I believe that is the Department the delegate should come from if we are going to get one who is prepared to work out the situation. I feel we ought to cut this at least one-half.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman knows that this is merely an authorization. It will come before the committee of which the gentleman is a very distinguished member. If the authorization is too large, you gentlemen may pass on the amount, and I trust the gentleman will take that responsibility and withdraw his objection at this time.

Mr. TABER. When we pass an authorization the department is always after the peak of the authorization, and while this is not one of the big items that will come up from time to time, nevertheless it is an item that makes one feel we should not make authorizations bigger than we figure should be used by the department. I feel that this item ought to be cut at least \$3,000. This is a rather large sum to take care of the expenses of one man over there, one good lawyer, and provide for such stenographic assistance as he might need, together with the \$250 to cover the dues which are required. It seems to me that is all we ought to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any more time than just state that when the proper place is reached I shall offer an amendment to cut it down to \$3,250.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. As the chairman of the committee has pointed out, this is simply an authorization, and the item will come before the committee presided over by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], of which I am the ranking minority member. We will scrutinize very carefully any request for money to carry out this purpose. I believe we ought to follow the Secretary of State at this time who specifically requests the sum of \$6,500 as an authorization, and I feel that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] can leave the details to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and we will inquire very carefully into the matter when Mr. Hull comes before us next year. I do not think the Treasury is going to suffer very much from this authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Resolution No. 118, Seventy-first Congress, approved February 1, 1931, providing for an annual appropriation to meet the share of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts to be amended to read as follows:

"There is hereby authorized an annual appropriation to pay the pro rata share of the United States in the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts.

"That not to exceed the sum of \$6,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for the expenses of participation by the Government of the United States in the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and/or of the commissions established by that committee, including traveling expenses; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without reference to the

Classification Act of 1923, as amended; stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent; purchase of necessary books and documents; printing and binding; official cards; entertainment; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 19, insert a new section, as follows:
"Sec. 2. That the provisions of these authorizations shall terminate June 30, 1941."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6673) providing for an annual appropriation to meet the share of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts, and for participation in the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and the commissions established by that Committee, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS AND ASSOCIATED UNIONS

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4901) to authorize appropriations to pay the annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions and ask unanimous consent that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4901, with Mrs. NORRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State in paying the annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions, including the International Astronomical Union, International Union of Chemistry, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, International Union of Mathematics, International Scientific Radio Union, International Union of Physics, and International Geographical Union, and such other international scientific unions as the Secretary of State may designate, such sum as may be necessary for the payment of such annual share, not to exceed \$9,000 in any one year.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Madam Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Madam Chairman, this bill asks for the participation of the United States in certain scientific union conventions, and calls merely for the payment of the dues of the United States and only for the dues. In the report will be found the various scientific unions and the amount called for in the case of each one, which runs from \$63.47 a year up to \$5,077 a year. We have been participating in these conferences since 1922. Last year the same bill passed and became an act, but did not get over to the Senate in time to get in the deficiency appropriation bill. I feel

and anticipate that one of the objections of the Republican watchdog of the Treasury, as branded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], is that this will be an annual appropriation. In answer to that permit me to say that the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], objected to the last bill because it was not an annual appropriation. He said if we were going to appropriate this every year, we should make it annually. That was his objection at that time.

Madam Chairman, there are a few arguments in favor of this bill which I would like to state, and at the same time I ask indulgence until I read some of the statements made by the scientific men of the different departments of the Government, as well as the chiefs of different universities and institutions of learning throughout the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. Madam Chairman, before the gentleman does that I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. This provides for participation in and payment of dues to these six or eight different conventions?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This will authorize our State Department to pledge our Government for the payment of these dues annually and it is also an authorization that would make in order an appropriation for us to participate each year. Suppose all of these eight conventions met at different times of the year, one meeting in February and one in March and one in April and one in May and one in June and one in November and one in December, if this bill passes, anyone from the floor, when the appropriate supply bill comes up, could offer amendments to appropriate sums of money for delegates to be sent to these various conventions to participate in them.

Mr. BLOOM. Not at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the language providing for participation would authorize the sending of delegates.

Mr. BLOOM. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon. This is simply for the payment of dues for the United States to participate. The delegates going over there would pay all their own expenses, all their railroad fare, their hotel bills, and everything else.

Mr. BLANTON. What I am talking about is the fact that this language used would authorize and make impervious to a point of order any amendment to pay expenses of delegates to participate, if the House saw fit to do so, but the main question I want to bring up is this: How is the gentleman from New York going to get around an adverse report by the State Department?

Mr. BLOOM. There is not an adverse report from the State Department.

Mr. BLANTON. The State Department before our Committee on Appropriations turned it down, did it not?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; the gentleman is reading the Belgium exposition report. This is a different one.

Mr. BLANTON. Was there not an adverse report made by Mr. Carr on this also, when Mr. Carr was before the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BLOOM. No; there has never been an adverse report on this at any time.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I may say to the gentleman that the Deputy Secretary of State, Mr. Carr, before the deficiency subcommittee, when we had the hearings on the \$112,000,000 deficiency bill a month or so ago, said they did not urge this appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I had in mind—the State Department, through Mr. Carr, did not urge it at all.

Mr. TABER. That is what occurred before us.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know whether the gentleman from Texas would call this urging it or not, but I would like to read from the letter of Secretary Hull, addressed to Hon. SAM D. McREYNOLDS, House of Representatives.

I am strongly of the opinion that the benefits which would be derived by American scientists and scientific organizations from the enactment of the contemplated legislation would far outweigh the modest expense involved. I therefore recommend the passage of H. R. 6781.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] if Mr. Carr did not appear before the deficiency subcommittee after that date?

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes; it was sometime this spring.

Mr. BLANTON. And stated they did not urge it?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, I only know what the Secretary signed and I shall have to go by that. Perhaps, Mr. Carr did not know about this particular bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to the gentleman that this Mr. Carr knows everything there is to be known about everything there is in the State Department.

Mr. BLOOM. I agree that he is a most efficient able gentleman and knows about everything regarding the State Department.

If I may proceed, we must keep in touch with the inventions and developments in the field of science in all countries and we can do it best through these unions.

It permits our scientists to work in close contact with other scientists for the development of common problems.

The Scientific Unions set up standards of weights and measures, definitions, names for new products, and so forth, so that scientific works can be used in all countries.

The Scientific Unions help our scientists to learn new methods at first hand.

The Scientific Union helps toward international understanding and good will by the union of thought of the leading scientists of the world.

Even now the Geographical Scientific Union is engaged upon the production of an international map of the world, each sheet of the map being made according to the highest standards accepted by international agreement. Another study of this society is one of overpopulation, a report to be presented at the next congress of this society to be held in Warsaw, Poland, and published for scholars all over the world.

The cost per year is really nominal—\$9,000 would be the maximum. Since the money is spent through the Secretary of State all unexpended balances would automatically be returned to the Treasury. No part of the money is used to pay transportation or personal expenses of any of the scientists who attend the international meetings.

The Scientific Unions publish pamphlets and bulletins of the latest information on various subjects which are sent to all the centers of learning in the United States including Government departments.

The presidents of 6 of the 8 international organizations are Americans. These are as follows: International Council of Scientific Unions, Dr. George E. Hale, honorary director Mount Wilson Observatory, Pasadena, Calif.; International Astronomical Union, Dr. Frank Schlesinger, director Yale University Observatory, New Haven, Conn.; International Union of Physics, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, director Norman Bridge Laboratory of Physics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.; International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, Dr. William Bowie, U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, Washington, D. C.; International Geographical Union, Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president, American Geographical Society, New York City; International Scientific Radio Union, Dr. A. E. Kennelly, professor emeritus of electrical engineering, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Now, let me read from a few of the letters that have come from various people throughout the country, which will give you an idea of what the people in the different branches of the Government think of this measure, as well as people connected with various colleges throughout the country.

Dean Henry G. Gale, of the University of Chicago, writes:

Perhaps the greatest service of all has been to increase international amity and to secure recognition of scientific workers in the United States by European men of science.

Dr. S. A. Mitchell, director of the Leander McCormick Observatory of the University of Virginia, writes that the unions "are of very great importance to scientific work."

Dr. John A. Fleming, of Carnegie Institution of Washington, writes:

Already the activities of the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics during the short period of its existence have stimulated and coordinated researches of the physics of the earth. Thus it has been the means of providing published data from all parts of the world, without which scientific and practical developments in geophysics, so useful to the United States, would have been much less fruitful and indeed largely impossible had our country stood alone in such work.

The Scientific Union publishes regularly data from 50 observatories in all parts of the world pertaining to the disturbances of the earth.

Dr. Isaiah Bowman, director of the American Geographical Society and president of the International Geographical Union, writes as follows:

I have left to the last the obvious advantages of personal contact with scholars working in the same field. This less tangible product of the congresses cannot be overemphasized. Not only does such cross-fertilization of ideas from country to country advance knowledge more rapidly through an exchange of facts but it introduces into the work of any given country the new methods and points of view that are so valuable in scientific progress. The effectiveness of American participation and the esteem in which our scholars are held are shown by the fact that 5 of the 7 unions now have American presidents. This of all times would seem to be the moment when we should reciprocate by cordial cooperation of the sort that official recognition alone can give.

Captain J. F. Hellweg, of the United States Navy and Superintendent of the United States Naval Observatory, states:

The international meetings have been of the greatest value in all the activities of the Naval Observatory. This value cannot be too strongly stressed.

Captain Hellweg says further:

During the last 30 years a large part of our fundamental work has been along lines in close cooperation with work recommended by the International Astronomical Union. The cooperative work on many technical details and programs covers many of our activities. For instance, there are 4 big catalogs, 2 of which have now been published and 2 are in the process of construction—fine examples of the cooperative work of the International Astronomical Union. In 1932 the investigation of the position of the equator was presented at Atlantic City and was in answer to the needed work along that line which was stressed by the union.

Mr. Henry G. Knight, Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils of the Department of Agriculture, states:

The work of the union has been of great benefit in securing international agreement upon questions of nomenclature, atomic weights, definitions, chemical constants, and other matters of general importance to all branches of chemistry, whether pure or applied. For this reason, if for no other, the work of the union should be continued, as there is no other organization performing a similar service.

Dr. E. C. Crittenden, Acting Director of the Bureau of Standards, speaking of advantages of the scientific unions to radio, states:

Radio is, of course, a subject in which the cooperation of agencies scattered over the whole world is desirable. Consequently, the work of this union has been particularly valuable and has given information which was not merely of interest scientifically but was also of great practical value in the discussion of international problems in the regulation of radio service.

Dr. William Bowie, Chief of the Division of Geodesy, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, states:

The International Geodetic and Geophysical Union has been of great benefit in the fields of geodesy and geophysics by bringing together at its assemblies the leading men of the adhering countries, about 30 in number, where they can outline and discuss problems, methods, and instruments. * * * I should view the discontinuance of these international assemblies as a national calamity. I cannot imagine our great country not making it possible to continue these congresses and to enable the geodesists and geophysicists from the United States to take an even more active part in them than has been the case in the past.

Dr. R. S. Patton, Director of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, states:

It would be most unfortunate if this country should withdraw from the International Council of Scientific Unions and of its subordinate unions. The cost to this country for adhering to these organizations is trivial as compared to the great benefits that result from such contacts.

Dr. Charles L. Reece, president of American Chemical Society, states:

I am satisfied that the chemists would regard the termination of the opportunities for international conferences as a calamity.

Dr. Robert A. Millikan, California Institute of Technology, states:

The cessation of activity of this sort and of the opportunities inherent in the Union of Pure and Applied Physics for establishing international contacts and understandings in other directions would be universally recognized among physicists as a major catastrophe.

Dr. Frank Schlesinger, president of the International Astronomical Union, states:

In my opinion the failure of the United States to adhere to the International Council of Scientific Unions would be something of a scientific calamity. The amount of money that would be saved by this failure is ridiculously small in comparison with the benefits that would ensue from the continuance of our adherence.

This resolution asks for \$9,000 a year, and as I stated before, it is simply to pay the dues so that we may send our representatives to these various conferences and unions. It does not call for the use of any of this money for any other purpose except the payment of our dues; and the reason we are asking for \$9,000 at this time, which is a little more than was necessary before, is on account of the difference in the exchange.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Madam Chairman, this bill is for the authorization of \$9,000 for the participation of delegates to different scientific organizations throughout the world.

They run down as low as \$63.47. One item runs as high as \$5,000.

The thing that I want to call to the attention of the committee specifically is that a subcommittee of the Committee on State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor had hearings on the bill and did not include it. A subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee had hearings on it last spring, and Mr. Carr, Deputy Secretary of State, appeared before that committee and told us that he did not urge the thing, that it would not be a matter of importance, and he did not believe very strongly in it.

After these hearings it was turned down. If we are ever going to stop spending money, this is the time to begin. If a scientific organization is not important enough to pay its dues of \$63, it ought not to exist.

Mr. BLOOM. It is important enough but they cannot pay the dues. If the United States joins, it must pay the dues. The organization cannot accept dues from individuals, it must be the country itself. The delegates pay their own expenses, hotel bills, and so on.

Mr. TABER. Why did the Deputy Secretary of State come before us and say that he did not urge it?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman will see in the letter of the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, that he would be very sorry if we did not join it.

Mr. TABER. Yes; I see what the Secretary of State said, but frankly, I do not see why we should do it, because after that letter was written the representative of the Secretary appeared before the Appropriations Committee and took the position that he did not urge the matter. Under these circumstances I cannot see why Congress should go ahead and authorize the expenditure of the money.

I appreciate that it is a small amount, and that is the only thing in favor of it.

Mr. BLOOM. We passed the same bill last year.

Mr. TABER. It was put on in the Senate.

Mr. BLOOM. No; the House of Representatives passed it.

Mr. TABER. It was put on in the Senate this year.

Mr. BLOOM. It came too late to be put on the deficiency bill.

Mr. TABER. It was turned down by our committee because we did not believe in it.

Mr. FISH. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes. After listening to the debate, I cannot see any reason why we should not be willing to enter into these conferences. We might obtain from any one of them scientific knowledge

that would be far more valuable than the few thousands it would cost the Government.

If this was a matter pertaining to the League of Nations, internationalism, sanctions, armaments, or relating to war or peace, that would be another matter. This relates to radio, chemistry, astronomy, and so forth. I see my colleague, a distinguished doctor [Mr. SROVICH] over there on the other side. We have not got all of the best chemists in the world, and we might get scientific knowledge that would far outweigh in value this small sum appropriated in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, in paying the annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions, including the International Astronomical Union, International Union of Chemistry, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, International Union of Mathematics, International Scientific Radio Union, International Union of Physics, and International Geographical Union, and such other international scientific unions as the Secretary of State may designate, such sum as may be necessary for the payment of such annual share, not to exceed \$9,000 in any one year.

Mr. TABER. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from New York. Your committee of 25 has gone into this matter very carefully. We think it is proper and we feel that we have given it more study than anyone here can obtain from merely reading the report and talking about it on the floor. I ask you to vote down the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mrs. NORTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4901, directed her to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW MARKETS FOR OUR FARM SUPPLIES

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a very interesting and inspiring address made by our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] over the National Broadcasting Co. last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. RICHARD M. KLEBERG, of Texas, over the National Broadcasting Co. network, 10:30 p. m., May 13, 1935:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, this complex economic world in which we live is full of problems. But it is not as full of problems as it was a few years ago. We have found solutions for some of them. We are finding solutions for more.

Let anyone who doubts this take a look around and then project his memory back to the drab hopelessness of 1932. The difference is stimulating, cheering. We are not out of the economic maze. But we are no longer stumbling around a deadly circle, either.

I believe that we now have in our hands, through legislative means, the solution of still another problem that has long beset a large and important class of our population. I speak of the problem of opening up new markets for our farm surpluses. Too often these surpluses have simply backed up on the millions that produced them.

If we can blast open a new channel for this dammed-up river and at the same time benefit all other classes, then we in Congress would be signally remiss in not blasting. It is encouraging to note that this new piece of economic engineering is simple and practicable. It will require no appropriation. It is easily administered. Its healthful and beneficial effects will be immediately apparent.

Of the 6,288,000 farmers of this country, nearly 6,000,000 are producers of fats and oils. By that I mean they produce cottonseed, corn, peanut, soybean, and other vegetable oils, or they raise livestock from which the equally healthful domestic fats are made.

These millions of American producers are now denied a huge market right at their front door. This market is largely in the possession of producers 5,000 miles away from our westernmost border. Now I am not an economic isolationist. All I say is that the edible fat market should at least be made available to American producers of fats and oils.

To give them this opportunity I have recently introduced a bill known as "H. R. 5587" in Congress, which will tax all margarine made of foreign oils 10 cents a pound. This will automatically and immediately replace Asiatic food oils in this industry by those produced on our own farms and ranches. It will open up new markets for our distressed American producers. Margarine offers the largest potential output for these surpluses of our home-grown fats and oils. The legislation I have offered has the simple purpose of putting the margarine industry on a domestic basis.

This legislation will not amend or in any way change the existing oleomargarine laws. It simply provides an effective means of compelling margarine manufacturers to use domestic products instead of foreign products. This will restore the market for domestic fats and oils to its pre-war status, without injury to any domestic group. Ninety-nine percent of the fats contained in margarine was of domestic origin before the war. Furthermore, my bill does not affect the importations of foreign oils for soap or other industrial uses.

Putting the industry on a domestic basis does not mean that the product will be substantially higher in price than when made from foreign oils. The difference is one of the relative price of foreign and domestic ingredients and whatever that may be is due to the difference in production costs and living standards of American and oriental producers. It will make possible the use of domestic fats in the higher priced edible uses. It is an economic waste to utilize these rich and desirable food fats as soap stock.

In order to adjust our agricultural plant to changed economic conditions at home and abroad we must find means of utilizing our acreage in the production of commodities for which there is a demand. The outstanding possibility along this line is the increased production of fats and oils, of which we import more than a billion pounds.

Because of the underconsumption of table spreads in the form of butter, due to the inadequate supply of this product and the inability of at least 25,000,000 of our citizens to buy it at prevailing prices, the largest market for our fats and oils is in the margarine industry.

If the legislation I have introduced is passed, it will prove immediately beneficial to American agriculture. At the present rate of margarine consumption, the replacement of imported oils by our own products would provide an additional annual market of over 150,000,000 pounds. This would require the cotton oil produced on 3,700,000 acres; the lard from four million six hundred thousand 200-pound hogs; or the edible fat from four million six hundred thousand 1,000-pound steers. In connection with the price of beef and pork to the consumer, the passage of this legislation will increase the value of the byproducts and offers an additional safeguard, therefore, against an increased price to the consumer for beef and pork. Thus more than 5,000,000 acres of our land would immediately be required in producing this quantity of additional fats, thereby relieving to that extent the need for production control of crops that are on an export basis.

The production of margarine needed to supply our deficiency in table spreads would require at least half the acreage that has been retired under the A. A. A. program, and would greatly benefit every agricultural section.

Thus we have an intensely practical method, through this legislation, of utilizing our retired acreage and in dealing with the problem of permanent adjustment of our national agricultural production.

From the standpoint of the public the enlarged use of domestic fats and oils in the margarine industry has a double significance: First, because the domestic product is of superior quality in physical texture and palatability; and, second, because of the effect of

the increased buying power of American agriculture upon general business conditions.

It strikes me that everyone who is genuinely interested in the welfare of American agriculture must favor this legislation, when the benefits to agriculture are so obvious.

Certainly no consuming group can oppose the bill in view of the superior quality of the product when made from domestic fats and when its passage will speed up recovery.

Certainly the traditional policy of organized labor is in accord with the idea of advancing the field and earnings of American industry, thereby preserving the American standard of living.

Foreign oil interests are expected to oppose this legislation as they did the excise tax passed by Congress last year. Students of the subject believe that in the long run the Philippine Islands will benefit by this legislation, as they have from the excise tax. The error of their previous opposition is now recognized by many friends of the Philippine Islands. The Philippines now have a practical monopoly in the domestic market for coconut oil. This market will be further extended if our domestic oils move into the edible field, leaving the industrial field wide open to Philippine imports.

Certainly no friend of this administration and the existing policies of this Government to improve the buying power of American farmers can object to providing a practical means, without processing taxes, cash benefits, or expensive administrative costs, which will be helpful in bringing about and maintaining parity price for American-produced fats and oils.

For all of the reasons I have cited, we should pass this legislation promptly. It would benefit all classes and deprive none of any advantage.

The passage of my bill will not remedy the un-American laws which exist in some of the States, but it will make it possible for American consumers to buy a product with a standard of quality that will insure its wholesomeness and its nutritive value, and at the same time permit them to trade with the farmers of this country, who are anxious to buy the things which are produced in other sections and industries. It will in no way change the existing oleomargarine laws, but will correct the justifiable complaint of the butter industry toward margarine made from the products of the "coconut cow" and will provide a profitable outlet for larger quantities of home-grown fats and oils in the domestic market to the advantage of both producers and consumers.

Hearings on the Kleberg bill will take place tomorrow before the House Committee on Agriculture. Every American farmer and stockman within hearing of my voice is entitled to this information so that under representative government he may have time to express his interest in this legislation to his Congressman or Senators. By this means the voice of the people is heard in our Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

An expression of your views on this legislation will unquestionably be appreciated by your Representatives in both branches of the Congress. The question to be answered is whether or not American markets should be at least available to American producers.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, with Mr. JONES in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an appropriation of \$20,000 annually is hereby authorized, \$10,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration; and \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the President and the executive secretary of the American group.

Sec. 2. That the American group of the Interparliamentary Union shall submit to the Congress a report for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, including its expenditures under such appropriation.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am very heartily in favor of the pending bill. We have under consideration a bill passed by the Senate. I introduced a similar bill in the House. By reason of the fact that the Senate had already acted favorably upon this measure, the Senate bill was substituted by the committee for the bill which I introduced.

This bill provides for our participation in the Interparliamentary Union. The Interparliamentary Union had its in-

ception in 1888, when representatives of a few foreign countries gathered informally to discuss matters relating to peace, to arbitration, and to the preservation of parliamentary government. These informal conferences through the years led to the organization in 1899 of the Interparliamentary Union, which has since existed. It is an association of more than 40 of the leading nations of the world, both in the Eastern and Western Hemispheres. This association has meetings annually at various places in the world. Two of those meetings since 1899 have been held in the United States, one in 1904 at St. Louis and one in 1925 in the city of Washington. For each of those meetings the Congress of the United States appropriated \$50,000 for the purpose of looking after the incidental expenses and taking proper care of the delegates from foreign nations. The United States has participated in each of those annual meetings since the first six. Since 1911 it has made annual appropriations for the support of this organization and, with the exception of 1 or 2 years, has also made appropriations for delegates to attend those annual sessions. Those annual meetings are simply, solely, and purely for the purpose of the discussion of matters of parliamentary, social, and economic problems common to many and sometimes to all of the countries which are members of the Union.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Gladly.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman tell us just what the primary results are of participation in the Interparliamentary Union? Is there a report made back to the House?

Mr. LANHAM. I am coming to that. I was trying to give a little incidental history by way of preface. This is a permanent organization to which the United States Government has for years contributed \$10,000 annually. The appropriation, I think, for the current year was reduced to \$7,500. The \$10,000 which we have appropriated annually to this organization is in accordance with a similar contribution made by each of the countries of the world, members of that union, in our class with reference to population, resources, and so forth. This organization uses this money for the purpose of its necessary officers and for the further purpose of the study of the various questions which are considered by and discussed at the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union. Each year there are certain subjects of mutual interest which are discussed, and may I impress upon you that this union has no binding effect and can have none whatever, upon any member of the union or any representative of any country coming to attend these meetings.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I think this \$10,000 we spend is money well spent, for it keeps up good feeling, especially between the Pan American countries and ourselves.

I am sure my colleague was here the last time this Interparliamentary Union met in Washington. There were over 40 countries represented right on the floor of this House. I attended every meeting daily and I was greatly impressed with the good that I thought came out of such meeting. I hope that the measure will pass.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this is the most profitable expenditure of money our Government can make in any foreign contact, because it gives us an opportunity to know what the people of the various nations are thinking about problems they have that are similar to problems we have, without any binding effect or force or obligation upon this country whatsoever. I think that to continue this contact and at the same time to know what these foreign countries are thinking, what their attitude may be toward certain problems, makes this a most profitable investment, small though it be.

The American participation—and each Member of Congress is eligible for membership in this organization—the American representation is in the hands of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union. Senator McKinley, of Illinois, was long the president of the American group. Lately, until he felt that he had to resign because of the

state of his health, our beloved colleague from Virginia, Mr. MONTAGUE, was for many years the president of the American group. The delegates who attend from America report to the Congress of the United States the gist of the discussions held at the annual meetings and all things of interest that may pertain to problems similar to those we have in this country. This information also may be had at any time from the secretary of the American group. I repeat that in my judgment the good we get from this association, in which we have participated financially since 1911, is the greatest possible that could come from such a small expenditure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My colleague was a delegate to one of these meetings, a representative of our Government. I would like for him to state from his own personal experience whether or not the discussion of the problems there and meeting with members of groups of other countries of the world was, in his judgment, worth while?

Mr. LANHAM. I thank my colleague and shall be glad to recite my own experiences.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my pleasure to attend one, and only one, of these annual meetings. That one was held at Bucharest a few years ago, and my appreciation of this organization has resulted from my attendance upon that meeting and my subsequent study of the Interparliamentary Union and of America's participation in it. Forty or more nations were represented at that meet, South American nations, North American nations, European nations, nations from all over the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Although there were two or three official languages of that meeting, each delegate had at his seat an earphone and just by turning the knob on a dial to the language in which he wished to hear the speech, and adjusting the earphones he heard it in his own tongue or in a tongue with which he was familiar simultaneously with the delivery of the speech in a foreign tongue by one of the delegates. In this way the proceedings of the whole convention were readily understood by men who speak different languages.

One of the subjects which was discussed at that meeting was with reference to underprivileged children and children in industry, and we learned something of these problems as they affected the various countries. From this interchange of ideas we got many helpful suggestions. Through this contact, which entails no obligation upon us, the findings of which body have no binding force upon us, we promote good will and a more cordial feeling among the nations of the world.

In this day, when parliamentary government is so seriously threatened, surely our Government, which is the very keystone of parliamentary government as it exists in the world today, should in every way possible promote this good purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. At the last meeting in this country, which was held in this Chamber, there were delegates from South American countries who first spoke in Spanish, then would translate their own speeches into French, and then into English.

Prior to that meeting it was dangerous for an American to travel in many parts of old Mexico; there was such an unfriendly feeling in the hearts of a great many Mexicans against Americans; but I have noticed that since that meeting a better feeling prevails, and it is now safe for Americans to travel all over old Mexico. I believe that that meeting did more to bring this situation about than anything else that could have occurred.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. Will not the gentleman give us a little more information as to the scope of these discussions at these meetings?

Mr. LANHAM. Each year certain topics are selected to be discussed. These topics are studied carefully by various committees, certain committees giving study to some of the topics to be discussed, and other committees giving study to other topics. These committees assemble all the data and information they can secure with reference to these common problems, and the benefit of this study of these problems is given at the annual meeting where the subjects are discussed.

As I say, this has no binding effect whatsoever upon us, but it does enable us in a cordial way to know what European countries are doing and to know what the European parliamentary representatives are thinking, and it gives us a contact that is most helpful.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. FIESINGER. How many delegates from this country attend the meetings of this Interparliamentary Union?

Mr. LANHAM. Just as many as can be provided for with the funds appropriated. On the occasion I spoke of, when I was a delegate, I think there were 10. Of course, the only expenses are the expenses directly connected with going to and from the place of the convention and one's expenses while at the convention. As many delegates are sent as possible with the appropriations provided.

Mr. FIESINGER. And if there were 15 delegates the money appropriated would be divided to pay all or part of the expenses of the 15?

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Not very long ago one of my constituents, a very fine young man, was killed in Mexico. Justice is very slow in being arrived at. The State Department is having difficulty. The consul is having great difficulty in this case. I believe this Interparliamentary Union might tend to make Mexico realize what she is doing. I am heartily in favor of this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. As against that one Massachusetts constituent killed in Mexico, the gentlewoman will remember two Mexican students who had been going to a university in the United States and on their way home were shot and murdered down in Oklahoma. This Congress paid their parents a large sum of money, because of their death. Those things happen interchangeably. Mexicans are killed in the United States and Americans are killed in Mexico. That always will happen.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Many more are killed in Mexico than in the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not believe that, because many Mexicans are killed all along the border. It will happen until the millenium comes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are far too many being killed in Mexico.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I say one or two things more? The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has just called my attention to one of the reports on the Interparliamentary Union appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 30, 1933, which was presented by Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from Minnesota asked about that and may be interested.

Mr. LANHAM. This is one of the reports. More extensive reports in detail may always be had from the executive secretary of the American group.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BACON. Can the gentleman tell us what topics will be discussed this coming year?

Mr. LANHAM. Personally I am not advised. Perhaps the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] can answer the question.

Mr. BLOOM. They have not as yet been given out. The council meets and they send over the list of subjects; then the President designates the people who are to go over there and be on the different councils in which the different subjects are taken up.

Mr. BACON. Can the gentleman tell us where the coming meeting will be held?

Mr. LANHAM. It will be held in Brussels, beginning the 26th of July. The meeting lasts about a week.

Mr. BACON. It is to be hoped that Congress will have adjourned by then?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. In order to give the gentleman an opportunity to clear the matter up, may I ask him this question? What connection, if any, does the Interparliamentary Union have with the League of Nations?

Mr. LANHAM. I am glad the gentleman asked the question, and I was just about to come to that. The Interparliamentary Union has no connection whatever with the League of Nations or any other international organization seeking to force its will upon any country in the world. It is purely advisory and purely for the purposes of discussion, information, and friendly contact of parliamentary representatives.

The Interparliamentary Union existed before the League of Nations was contemplated, is entirely independent and has no binding force or effect upon any nation and seeks to have none. Let me say further there was brought out in the hearings before the committee on this bill the exception taken by a member of the committee to the fact that at the last meeting of the Interparliamentary Union there was some discussion with reference to the Kellogg Peace Pact. Of course, no action could be taken that would be binding upon anybody; but if the Interparliamentary Union should discuss the Kellogg Peace Pact or any other policy of the American Government it is advisable that we have representatives there to hear what they say and to know what their attitude is. It is worth the money to know that, to hear it, and to learn what they think of us, because they cannot bind us nor can we bind them in this union.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. I appreciate it is entirely informal and involuntary, but will the gentleman explain what the mechanics are of translating those discussions into benefits so far as the legislative processes of this country are concerned?

Mr. LANHAM. Whenever questions arise of an international character, the information is available always in part with reference to the particular problems under discussion in the reports that are made annually to the Congress by the American group of the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union and in detail through the executive secretary, who has his office in the city of Washington.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 55 minutes to America's greatest nationalist, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, this proposal is entirely different from every other proposal that has come before this Committee today. It is purely a political proposal; that is, it proposes that we participate in the political affairs and in the political discussions of Europe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Has the gentleman ever attended one of these interparliamentary meetings in Europe?

Mr. TINKHAM. I have not; but I have read the reports, and I have here the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that I have attended two such meetings, and he is very much mistaken when he makes the statement it is a political meeting.

Mr. TINKHAM. I shall read the agenda for the coming meeting. Of course, under ordinary conditions international economics takes on a political character, and I should consider a discussion of international economics a discussion of international politics.

I read from an official bulletin, the Interparliamentary Bulletin. Forthcoming Interparliamentary Meetings.

Wednesday, April 24 and Thursday, April 25

Subcommittee on economic and financial questions

AGENDA

To discuss:

1. Economic problems: (a) The protection of agriculture in industrial countries and of industry in agricultural countries. (b) The competition between sugar and saccharine.
2. Demographic problems. The position of overpopulated countries and the possibilities for colonization.

"The possibilities of colonization". This does not interest us. We withdrew from our last colonial possession in the East only recently.

3. Financial and monetary problems: Monetary stabilization and the question of an international currency.
4. Other proposals.

Friday, April 26, 4 p. m.

Subcommittee on juridical questions

AGENDA

The main questions before the subcommittee are: (a) The system of capitulations.

- (b) Harmonization of the Briand-Kellogg Pact with the Covenant of the League of Nations.

This is certainly a political question. This certainly involves us politically.

- (c) The codification of world law.
- (d) Questions submitted as examples by M. V. V. Pella, vice president of the committee.

Saturday, April 27, 10 a. m.

Full committee on political and organization questions

AGENDA

1. To hear the report presented by M. H. Loewenherz (Poland) on the preliminary draft resolution submitted by the subcommittee on the representative system on the legislative function.

Poland is a dictatorship.

2. To hear the report presented by M. C. Costamagna (Italy) on "The Publication, Exchange, and Rationalization of Legislative Documents."

Italy is a dictatorship. How, in the circumstances, can Italy or Poland instruct in free parliamentary affairs? How can Europe do so?

3. To hear the report presented by M. Cosma (Rumania) on "The Organization and Work of Parliamentary Committees."

Who has ever said that Rumania had a free parliamentary system?

4. Other proposals.
5. To appoint one or more rapporteurs.

Full committee on the reduction of armaments

AGENDA

1. To consider the attitude to be adopted by the Union with regard to the question of disarmament.

This is a political matter which the League of Nations is considering. Armament and disarmament are matters of the highest political character.

2. To examine the question of the manufacture of arms, munitions, and war material.

This is purely a question for Europe, purely political in character and having to do with the League of Nations.

3. To consider the question of the trade in arms, munitions, and war material.

This is a question of the same political character. European disarmament and like proposals are European questions for the consideration of Europe. Europe should not be permitted to impose her policies and her political systems upon the United States.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. Since we are not a member of the League of Nations, does not the gentleman from Massachusetts believe it advisable that we should discuss these questions where there are no commitments?

Mr. TINKHAM. I do not believe we should put one foot over the threshold into European political affairs. If we put one foot forward, we are involved. I am going to show how our involvement through this very organization not only brought us into the World War but almost made us a member of the League of Nations.

Mr. COLDEN. The gentleman refers to them as European questions. They undoubtedly involve this country as well as the other nations of the world, and they are of concern to us.

Mr. TINKHAM. It does not seem to me that European questions, political in character, should be of any concern to us. This is the line of demarcation, it seems to me, which should characterize the American foreign policy and tradition which go back to the old admonition from Washington himself—no participation in the political affairs of Europe and no foreign entangling political alliances. If we become a member of an organization which is discussing these questions, political in character, we put our foot over the threshold. If we put our foot over the threshold, we inevitably go further. I am now going to show how this very organization really involved us, in my opinion, in the World War, and how it also nearly precipitated us into the League of Nations.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. Our State Department is carrying on conversations with the nations of the world at all times. Why is it not justifiable that groups of our citizenship should meet with groups of citizens from other nations and have a proper discussion of these questions?

Mr. TINKHAM. Again, I simply reiterate what I have said: I do not believe we wish, in any way, officially to discuss political questions with Europe. If we do, we are involved. I believe the United States should not participate in the political affairs of Europe. Had we not begun to participate in them by joining this very organization, we should not be in our present economic situation, with our institutions shaken to their foundations, with unemployment unparalleled in our history, with enormous and ever-mounting debts and taxes, as well as a constant rise in the cost of living.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. So far as I know, the American representatives have never participated in any discussion involving European questions which were solely and technically European; but what harm can there be at these meetings in listening to the discussions as to the situation that exists?

Mr. TINKHAM. Because it is a move in the wrong direction; it is a move toward the political affairs of Europe and involvement therein. The direction is all-important, particularly in relation to foreign policies.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. I am informed that the gentleman from Massachusetts is one of the greatest travelers in the country. Did he not do that in order to get information and reflect the information of other nations? Is not the gentleman indulging in the very thing he is charging against this measure?

Mr. TINKHAM. I have traveled considerably but I have never traveled in my official capacity of United States Representative. I reiterate I do not believe that the United

States should participate in any formal or official way in any organization which discusses the political affairs or even the economic affairs of Europe.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask a further question?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the constitution of the Interparliamentary Union every member of every parliamentary body in the world is technically a member, and the gentleman himself is a member. If we are members ought not we to have a right to participate in their considerations?

Mr. TINKHAM. The question is, Shall we?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts is a great traveler. He goes to Europe to furnish the G. O. P. with elephants. The Grand Old Party would run out of elephants if he did not go there. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINKHAM. Now, I am going to read the history of this organization. Why were we involved in the World War in Europe? Simply because we joined an international organization. We put our foot over the threshold and were then drawn into the maelstrom.

In 1887 a voluntary delegation of members of the British Parliament and of British trade unions came to the United States to present an address in favor of a treaty of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States. They were introduced to President Cleveland by Andrew Carnegie.

There is no treaty of arbitration yet between the two countries.

In 1888 there was a meeting in Paris of members of the English and French Parliaments, at which there was discussed a treaty of arbitration between England and France.

In 1889 there was a meeting in Paris of members of nine different parliaments, including the English and the French. At this meeting, for the first time, the name "interparliamentary conference" was adopted.

In 1899 these interparliamentary meetings were for the first time given the name "Interparliamentary Union." In 1889 also the First Hague Conference was held, the purpose of which was stated to be "for the specific settlement of international disputes." The Interparliamentary Union was the original promoter of that conference, which was limited entirely to the question of specific settlement of international disputes. In 1907 the Second Hague Conference was called. In 1905 and 1906 the so-called "Algeciras Conferences" were held in Europe. In those conferences the then President, Theodore Roosevelt, interfered because we had already moved in the direction of Europe by joining the Interparliamentary Union and in participating in the First Hague Conference. This was the first intrusion of the United States into the strictly political affairs of Europe.

After the beginning of the World War former President Theodore Roosevelt demanded that the United States enter the European conflict, because we had participated in the two Hague Conferences. From this trend of participation in the affairs of Europe came the arguments and influences for us to enter a league to enforce peace, to which President Wilson gave his adherence. This was the philosophy and thought which finally drew us into the World War, and which finally threatened us with the covenant of the League of Nations to enforce the Versailles Treaty, a treaty of war and not of peace.

Entering the Interparliamentary Union, or entering the First Hague Conference, both of which we entered purely for the purpose of promoting arbitration, gave no excuse for the United States to join any European political body. For us to have favored arbitration was correct.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does not the gentleman think from a political, social, and economic standpoint, it is a wonderful idea to have Members of this parliamentary body, the House and the Senate, send representatives over to an organization of that type, to at least present to them the finest example of

what a constitutional parliamentary government stands for, without having any alliance with them.

Mr. TINKHAM. That goes exactly to the heart of the issue that we are discussing, whether we should have any political relationship with Europe.

Mr. SIROVICH. Not relationship, just an interchange of views.

Mr. TINKHAM. The French and English had an interchange of views regularly before 1914, and that policy developed into a commitment in the war which broke out in 1914. European history shows that preceding nearly every war there were interchanges of ideas, there were meetings of diplomats, all of which developed into commitments, either moral or legal.

My argument against joining this organization is that it has departed entirely from its original purpose, namely, to promote arbitration, and has become an organization which discusses political matters.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will my distinguished friend, for whom I have a wholesome admiration, state for the benefit of our colleagues where since 1889, there has been a commitment of the United States to any of the programs or policies of these foreign organizations, in which we have participated every year?

Mr. TINKHAM. I have tried, apparently unsuccessfully, to show that if we move step by step in a certain direction, there is an inevitable result. I have shown that we first entered an organization promoting arbitration, that we then participated in a Hague Conference, which also was for the promotion of arbitration, that this led an American President, Theodore Roosevelt, not long after to interfere in the Algeciras Conferences, which were considering strictly European political affairs, basing his reasons for doing so on the fact that we were a member of this union and had participated in the Hague Conference.

Finally, after the World War was declared, he argued that we should enter the war because we had been parties to the Hague Conferences. That was followed by a much more ambitious proposal, namely, that we enter a league to enforce peace. Mr. Wilson was lured into the war to establish and to enforce peace; then he evolved a League of Nations, which has been repudiated by the American people.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman believe that we ought to keep our missionaries and churchmen out of foreign countries?

Mr. TINKHAM. Oh, no; they are not political. It is political matters to which I refer.

Mr. BLANTON. If it is wrong on political matters, why is it not wrong on church matters?

Mr. TINKHAM. I do not consider ecclesiastical matters political. Some people, during the past 20 years, have tried to merge the two, but I have always been opposed to it, believing in the soundness of the old American principle of the separation of church and state.

Mr. BLANTON. Why would it not eventuate in harm for us to inflict our church ideas on foreigners as well as our political ideas?

Mr. TINKHAM. If the Congress of the United States officially should attempt to do that, of course, it would be objectionable. What I am objecting to is the action of this Congress in participating officially in conferences in relation to political affairs. I do not think we should do so. I do not think it is to our interest to do so. In fact, perhaps it is to our ruin to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. But this is not Congress. This is merely the individuals themselves. Each individual Member goes.

Mr. TINKHAM. In passing this resolution the Congress officially approves the action of the officials of this Government, paid from the Public Treasury, in discussing political matters.

Mr. BLANTON. We passed a law that provides passports for the gentleman when he wants to go to Siam.

Mr. TINKHAM. But I go as an individual. There is a great difference.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. This Union discusses many questions that are economic and social. The gentleman does not construe all those questions to be political, does he?

Mr. TINKHAM. Probably not all of them, no; but enough, such a large number, as to make it very objectionable.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. The United States of course has been in this organization for many years. In 1904 the annual convention was held in this country at St. Louis. In what political controversies of Europe during the time we have been in this Interparliamentary Union has it involved us?

Mr. SIROVICH. That is what I asked before.

Mr. TINKHAM. I have not read all these data about the Union. They are voluminous, and I cannot detail each issue, but my point is that the direction that this Union takes, the direction it has taken, the political character it has adopted, departing entirely from its original purpose previous to 1914, namely, arbitration, lead us toward Europe, toward European political questions. I believe this is a dangerous direction. I believe it is now more dangerous than ever before for us to meddle in the political affairs of Europe, a Europe which is governed by dictators, by homicidal Communists.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. Did not the gentleman from Massachusetts support the program for this country sending a delegate to the Agricultural Institute at Rome, which is also an international organization?

Mr. TINKHAM. Well, I had no objection to that. It was narrowed down to a specific subject, and I thought there might be some benefit in having the statistics which were reported to that Institute given to us, as they were the broadest statistics in relation to agricultural production that were produced. I regard that as different.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman tell us one benefit that flowed from that conference?

Mr. TINKHAM. I do not know that I can.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I told the gentleman when I tried to get him to vote against it.

Mr. TINKHAM. That would be rather an argument on my side. [Laughter.]

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. On the same basis, why should the gentleman oppose the entrance of this country into the International Labor Organization, which deals with the problems of labor?

Mr. TINKHAM. I opposed our going into the International Labor Organization on the same general ground. The International Labor Organization was a part of the Versailles Treaty. It was the left wing of the League of Nations, the right wing being the political Court of the League. My argument in opposition was that if we entered either one, we should eventually find ourselves in the central part, namely, the Covenant of the League. As I do not believe that we should join any European political organization, my position is just as consistent here as it was in relation to the International Labor Organization. The Labor Organization is interwoven with the Secretariat of the League, with the political Court of the League, and also with the Council of the League, all political bodies, so I objected to making any commitments in that direction.

Mr. COLDEN. The gentleman is aware, however, that in the acceptance of the United States in the International Labor Organization, it was clearly stated that it was not to have anything to do with the League of Nations?

Mr. TINKHAM. That is true. That kept us out of the Covenant. But if we went into the League, if we went into the Court, which is the right wing of the League, and then went into the Labor Organization, which is the left wing of the League, of course, the argument would be overwhelming that we should go into the Covenant, and then we should find ourselves full members of the League. That is why I fought it so bitterly. So long as I remain a Member of Congress, at the proper time I shall oppose appropriations for the International Labor Organization and shall do everything else possible to withdraw the United States from that organization.

I wish also to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that the resolution before us is entirely misleading. It is stated that the amount authorized, \$10,000, is for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union "for the promotion of international arbitration." Any question concerning arbitration was disposed of entirely by the setting up of the League Court and by the assent of some of the nations of the world to the optional clause of the Court which made arbitration compulsory. So the resolution on its face does not reveal its real purpose.

Another thing—I hesitate to mention it—is not this a genteel form of international graft? Does it not give certain Members of this House, and only a very limited number, a European tour? Does it not disburse funds from the Public Treasury to give free European tours to Members of Congress? I do not think the American people will look with favor upon this proposition to send a certain few select Members of Congress regularly on European tours.

This bill proposes to make permanent what heretofore has been an annual appropriation. You must therefore determine as representatives of the people whether you wish to establish a permanent policy of annually sending a few select Representatives of this House on a European tour.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. It is only an authorization for a permanent appropriation, not a permanent appropriation. The appropriation still would have to be made each year; and, if for any reason the appropriation should not be made, it need not be made.

Mr. TINKHAM. It helps, of course, to have the appropriation made annually.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative.

Mr. BLANTON. On the question raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts, let me call his attention to the fact that our distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH] has been a delegate one time. Here is our distinguished friend and colleague from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who has been over there as a delegate once. Here is our friend from Oklahoma, JED JOHNSON, who has been over there one time.

Mr. TINKHAM. I have said nothing personally disparaging of the Members who have been delegates.

Mr. BLANTON. And here is our beloved friend, the distinguished former Governor of Virginia, whom we all love, Mr. MONTAGUE.

I ask the gentleman: Has it not been worth while, do we not get benefit from daily association with these eminent gentlemen who give us the benefit of whatever they have gotten over there? I think it is money well spent. I do not think this is a junket at all. They give the people in other countries the American viewpoint on all questions.

Mr. TINKHAM. My position, as I said, is that this Union is no longer accomplishing its original purpose, namely, to promote arbitration. The subject of arbitration is no longer an issue, with the League Court a reality, and with the right

of the United States to go to the League Court when it wants to submit any question to it for arbitration.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Would the gentleman restrict arbitration to its military connotation? Arbitration does not refer solely to war and belligerent enterprises.

Mr. TINKHAM. No; arbitration is a preliminary attempt to settle international disputes and to avoid war.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may make a point of order that there is no quorum present?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter. We should not dispose of a bill of this character with so few Members in the Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. TINKHAM. I am very glad to have the gentleman make his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Let us finish the bill, we have waited here an hour to do it. How much time has the gentleman remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will agree to an adjournment immediately after the House acts on the pending bill, I will withdraw my point of no quorum.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will agree, so far as he is concerned, to the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. I am very much interested in the gentleman's discussion. I would like to know the gentleman's position. I would like to know whether he is in favor of this movement to support international arbitration which does not commit our country to any alliance or agreements with other countries?

Mr. TINKHAM. The League Court, which we all know is a political court, disposes of the question of the arbitration of disputes. First, it disposes of them automatically as between the members; and, second, resort may be had to it by nations which, like the United States, are not members of the League. So arbitration is no longer an active international or national issue.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman from Texas a while ago mentioned three or four Members of the House who on one occasion were delegates to meetings of this Interparliamentary Union. Has it not been the practice to appoint different Members each year to attend these meetings, or are some Members reappointed year after year?

Mr. TINKHAM. I think the honorable Representative will find that a small number of Members have gone a number of times.

Mr. BOILEAU. I am wondering if these meetings are a benefit to the Congress of the United States and to our people and whether or not the maximum benefit could not be derived by having different delegates attend these meetings, thereby spreading out the wisdom that is received and the inspiration that they might receive by having this contact with other parliamentary bodies?

Mr. TINKHAM. That might be so, and, again, it might not be so.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does the gentleman state that the same men go year after year?

Mr. TINKHAM. I have not looked over the record very carefully, but I think there are, as I stated a while ago, a number who make the European tour rather regularly.

Mr. BOILEAU. I have not had this information before and I have no knowledge of it myself; therefore I think it would be very illuminating to the Members of the House to know whether or not it has been the practice of having as many go as we can possibly accommodate with the small appropriation. Can the gentleman give us any information as to how the delegates are selected; that is, are they selected by the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, or by whom?

Mr. TINKHAM. I understand the selection is made by an executive committee of the American section of this organization. I suppose there are certain members who submit requests to go, and it may be that selection is made according to seniority or in some other way. I do not know. I think the honorable Representative from Texas can tell us how the selection is made.

Mr. LANHAM. It is made by the official board of the American interparliamentary group. Governor MONTAGUE has been president of this group up to this time. Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, is now president of the group.

Mr. TINKHAM. Have these gentlemen gone rather regularly to the conferences?

Mr. LANHAM. Senator BARKLEY, I believe, attended two. Governor MONTAGUE, as the president, attended regularly, because he has had in his charge necessarily over there the supervision of the conferences of the American group within itself.

Mr. TINKHAM. Are not the selections made by the executive committee of which they are members, or are they made by the president?

Mr. LANHAM. The president of the American group. Each Member of the American Congress is a member of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union. The meetings of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union are held here each year. Each Member of Congress gets a notice. The gentleman from Massachusetts received notice of the meeting of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union recently held, at which these matters were discussed. Of course, it has always been incumbent upon the president of the group to go if he can because he supervises the conferences of the representatives of the American group.

Mr. TINKHAM. Do I understand the president of the group selects the members who are to go?

Mr. LANHAM. It is made, I understand, by the President and other officers of the group. However, this has included from time to time many Members who have no connection whatever with the official organization of the American group. I had none. The gentleman from New York had none, and the gentleman from Oklahoma had none. At the one meeting which I attended there were only two, as I recall, who were members of the official body of the American group.

Mr. TINKHAM. The honorable Representative from Texas is then a little uncertain how the selections are actually made?

Mr. LANHAM. They are made by the American group itself.

Mr. TINKHAM. Does the gentleman mean by the whole group?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not know. They have not been made as yet for this year. The American group will determine the matter for itself as to the representatives that will go.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. Can the gentleman advise the House as to the number of delegates sent over there each year?

Mr. TINKHAM. I shall have to refer you to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that I made reference to that matter in my remarks upon this bill. The

number that can go is necessarily restricted, of course, by the appropriation, although it has been customary to try to get the presence of any Members of Congress who may be in Europe in addition to those who may be sent over under this appropriation. There are others who go at their own expense. It is sought to have as large a representation as possible. The expenses of all the delegates every year have not been paid in full. The expenses, too, I may say, are paid only to the meeting, during the meeting, and for the return trip. There is nothing allowed for incidental expenses. If one wants to travel around Europe or anything of that kind, no allowance is made. The amount appropriated is apportioned upon vouchers approved by the State Department for the expenses of the delegates. It may be said that sometimes the amount received by each delegate has not been sufficient to meet the actual expenses of going to the meeting.

Mr. BOILEAU. There are usually 5 members, 10 members, or 20 members?

Mr. LANHAM. On the one occasion I went, I should say there were 10 or 12.

Mr. BOILEAU. And the \$10,000 is divided up equally among those who attend?

Mr. LANHAM. The money is not divided among them; no. They present vouchers covering their actual expenses. These vouchers are scrutinized by the State Department and gone over very carefully to see that they are restricted to the necessary expenses incident to the trip to attend the Interparliamentary Union and return.

Mr. BOILEAU. It means practically the same thing; that is, that the \$10,000 is divided equally among the 10 who attend?

Mr. LANHAM. This money is appropriated for the purpose of paying the expenses of the delegates attending, although it has not always been sufficient in the past.

Mr. BOILEAU. My interest is not in the sense that I have a desire to go, because I could not be reelected from my district in Wisconsin should I attend a meeting of this kind at Government expense.

Mr. LANHAM. Personally I think the gentleman would make a good delegate. I think he would find it profitable if he attended one of these meetings and that he would be very enthusiastic about them.

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank the gentleman, and I wish to assure him that undoubtedly I would receive some benefit; but I doubt if it could be communicated back to the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to me?

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit.

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from New York.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have tried to follow the gentleman very carefully, but I do not know whether it is clear to me yet, and will the gentleman answer this question: Whom would I have to see if I wanted to go as a delegate?

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to my colleague from New York that I am not a member of the official board of the American group.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have been trying to find out who it is.

Mr. LANHAM. Let me answer the question.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit, my colleague from New York has had all kinds of difficulty getting any jobs out of this administration; can we not do something for him now?

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that, like himself, I am a member of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union through my membership in this body.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We cannot find out who picks these delegates to go.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will permit, does not Mr. Call pick them?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Who is the executive committee? What is all this mystery about?

Mr. LANHAM. So far as I am concerned, there is no mystery, and I may say that on the occasion when I went,

it seemed difficult to get a sufficient number of delegates to attend.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have no desire to go myself.

Mr. LANHAM. And Governor MONTAGUE, who was then president of the American group, asked me if I would go.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from New York.

Mr. TABER. It seems that the committee is divided into two groups, one of which is fearful lest they may be damaged in their districts because they go on a junket, while the other group is trying to find out how they can go on a junket. It is perfectly clear that this is a junket. It is perfectly clear that \$10,000 of this money is for a junket. The report of the committee indicates that \$7,500 of the money has heretofore been used in providing for the overhead of this international organization, and this bill proposes to raise that \$7,500 to \$10,000. It would seem to me that \$10,000, or even \$7,500, is a lot of money.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I have not the floor, but it would seem to me we ought to beat the bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me to say to the gentleman from New York that the annual appropriation has been \$10,000 a year consistently, and it was reduced to \$7,500 in the last appropriation, which has made it even harder upon the union itself, because of the variation in the exchange.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I cannot understand for what they even used \$7,500.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that the Honorable Theodore E. Burton was president of this Commission for a number of years, and was very active in it and very much interested in it?

Mr. TINKHAM. He was very active in it and was also very much in favor of our entering the League of Nations. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The distinguished gentleman from New York asked who selected these delegates. I am wondering if it is not Arthur D. Call who selects them. He did several years ago, and I presume he is still doing it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. He is not a Member of Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You would not expect a Member of Congress to select them.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman mean to say that an outsider, not a Member of Congress, picks the Members of the Congress who are to represent the Congress?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That was my impression a few years ago.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, Senator BARKLEY, who is the president of the American group, was asked the question how these delegates are selected, and he said they are selected by the president of the local organization in connection with the executive council. There is no mystery about it, as suggested by the gentleman from New York, who is just as much a member of the organization as any other person in this body, and if he wanted to know or had any reason to have this information all he had to do was to attend the meeting when it was held. If he does not know, it is because of negligence on his part, and the gentleman should not try to cast any reflection here that there is any mystery about it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative of Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will look at the RECORD he will see a colloquy between myself and our former dis-

tinguished colleague, Hon. Theodore Burton, a Member of both the House and Senate during his service, where he stated that as president himself he had the control of the selection of the members to go over as delegates. He attended these meetings abroad many times. He had been the president, the same as Governor MONTAGUE has been president, and the same as Senator BARKLEY is now president. The president of our American group himself was the one who made the selection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Now, I have only 1 or 2 minutes left. The headquarters of this organization are in Geneva.

This legislation is taking us to Europe; it is taking us to Geneva, the political headquarters of Europe. There is no Member here who does not know that the vast majority of the people of this country are opposed to our interfering or meddling in the political affairs of Europe. Therefore, in my opinion, we are taking a step in the wrong direction if we approve this legislation.

This organization, in 1934, interpreted the Briand-Kellogg Pact, and at that time it was proposed that on Friday, April 26, 1935, there would be taken up by a subcommittee the harmonization of the Briand-Kellogg Pact with the Covenant of the League of Nations. This is a political act. It involves our treaty obligations. No foreign body should be allowed to interpret for us our moral or legal obligations. The course and direction of the foreign policy of a nation is one of vital importance. We are proceeding along the wrong road into European political affairs if we adopt the resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, this is one occasion when it is peculiarly distasteful to me to rise in opposition to a bill, due to the fact that its proponents, Members of this House who are interested in its passage, are my friends, the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. McREYNOLDS, and my dear friend from Texas, Mr. LANHAM. I dislike to rise in opposition to a matter in which they seem so interested, but as to this apparently innocuous bill, a bill solely for the purpose of appropriating \$10,000 for expenses of a delegation going to Europe and \$10,000 for the expenses of the Interparliamentary Union, I feel as I did on the I. L. O., the International Labor Organization, when that measure came before the House. I opposed that bill and said that it was but another way of getting us entangled in European affairs. I do not want to go into a discussion of the labor situation, except to say that the American Federation of Labor 2 years ago passed a resolution, so far as the I. L. O. is concerned, excoriating it, and this last year, after Congress passed the bill, they merely mentioned it in their report, that since it was in existence they might as well have a labor man go over there. In this present bill you have the situation referred to by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], of discussing political matters in the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. In a moment. If this union was for the purpose solely of discussing parliamentary procedure, or anything like it, I would not oppose it, but when we get into a proposition with Europe, with Hitler and Stalin and Mussolini running their governments and our delegates supposed to sit in a conference, expecting to bring back from that conference something which is good for the American people, I doubt the wisdom of it, and I doubt the wisdom of their ever bringing anything back to us which will be helpful to our institutions in the United States. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Has the gentleman ever attended one of these Conferences?

Mr. CONNERY. I have not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Possibly if the distinguished gentleman had ever attended one he would not make the statement that it is a political conference. May I add also that the Interparliamentary Union, generally speaking, is composed of men and women from almost every civilized nation of the globe who are sincerely interested in preserving

the peace of the world. Both Interparliamentary Peace Conferences I attended back in 1927 and 1929 made a profound impression upon me, and I am confident they did also on all the other delegates. I heartily agree with much the gentleman has stated, but I cannot agree that this is a political conference.

Mr. CONNERY. Of course the gentleman is entitled to believe that way. We had a disarmament conference down here in Washington that was not of the Interparliamentary Union. It was called by President Harding. They had the diplomats of the world there. The other nations scrapped blue prints, and we scrapped millions of dollars' worth of our ships. We do not want any more of those conferences. If we want disarmament conferences, we do not want them in the Interparliamentary Union under the auspices of the League of Nations. We want conferences where the President of the United States at any time can call over the premiers of foreign countries, or representatives of the governments of the world, to sit down at the White House where he may say, "Now, what are you going to do about disarmament?" Since the time the gentleman refers to, he knows that France and Germany and England and Russia and all the nations of Europe are armed to the teeth. They have plenty of money to arm their soldiers, but not a nickel to pay their debt to the United States. I do not think this is any time to be spending money to send delegates to conventions that are meaningless, so far as the United States is concerned.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. TRUAX. In my judgment the gentleman has made the most effective speech against this bill that I have yet heard. The gentlemen sponsoring this bill are good friends of mine, Mr. McREYNOLDS and Mr. LANHAM, but I think the time has arrived when we must stop passing bills because of friendship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes more to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TRUAX. Europe secured a moratorium on her debt, and I think we ought to have a moratorium on European conferences, with our delegates' expenses paid by the Government.

Mr. CONNERY. So do I. I feel very deeply about this matter. As I say, I dislike to oppose two very dear friends of mine in Congress who are for this legislation, and sincerely so, but I think we have had enough of these conferences with Europe. To repeat that old axiom of Will Rogers, "We never lost a war and we never won a conference." It is true. It sounds humorous, but it is true. The diplomats that we send to deal with the European nations are not trained in diplomacy. Foreign diplomats are trained in diplomacy from childhood. We send over our amateur diplomats to deal with them, and the foreign diplomats always have the cards stacked against us before the game starts. That is the way we come out of all these conferences. I do not like that. I do not think there is any good for the United States in a conference of this sort. I am against it. I hope the House will vote down this proposition. It sounds like a small matter to say "\$10,000." My friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] says it is worth \$10,000. Mr. BLANTON is willing to allow \$10,000 to go to Europe, but when we discuss labor matters on the floor he does not favor \$10,000 appropriations for decent living wages for the workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] has expired.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. TINKHAM. For a moment.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Now, the gentleman has had all the time he wanted to fight this out. I arranged the time to call this up for your convenience. Would the gentleman

under those circumstances undertake to make a point of no quorum when he thinks he is about to get beaten?

Mr. TINKHAM. I want to defeat this measure, which I believe is thoroughly unsound and unpatriotic, by any method that is legitimate. It is legitimate for me to make a point of no quorum and I insist upon it.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman can never have the help of this chairman hereafter in getting time.

Mr. TINKHAM. I am sorry. The gentleman did not give me the time. Does the gentleman from Tennessee try to impose upon me by saying he gave me the time?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Did I not tell the gentleman I would hold that until he could get onto the floor?

Mr. TINKHAM. Oh, that is a different proposition. The gentleman said he gave me time. He did not give me the time; the honorable Representative from New York did that. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. And then we had to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. TINKHAM. I will, but I am going to insist upon my point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 13, noes 36.

So the Committee refused to rise.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has counted. Fifty-one Members are present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 74]

Adair	Dirksen	Kennedy, N. Y.	Rich
Andresen	Disney	Kerr	Richards
Andrew, Mass.	Dondero	Kimball	Robertson
Ashbrook	Doutrich	Kleberg	Robinson, Utah
Bankhead	Duncan	Kniffin	Rogers, Okla.
Beam	Dunn, Miss.	Knutson	Romjue
Bell	Eaton	Lambertson	Russell
Berlin	Engel	Lamneck	Ryan
Binderup	Englebright	Lee, Okla.	Sabath
Bland	Ferguson	Lemke	Sanders, La.
Bolton	Flannagan	Lewis, Md.	Sauthoff
Brennan	Ford, Calif.	Lucas	Schaefer
Brooks	Ford, Miss.	McClellan	Schneider
Brown, Mich.	Fulmer	McFarlane	Schuetz
Buckley, N. Y.	Gambrill	McGehee	Scott
Burch	Gasque	McGroarty	Scrugham
Burdick	Gassaway	McLaughlin	Seger
Caldwell	Gearhart	McMillan	Shannon
Cannon, Mo.	Gehrmann	McSwain	Short
Cannon, Wis.	Gifford	Maverick	Sisson
Carden	Gildea	May	Smith, Wash.
Carpenter	Gillette	Meeks	Smith, W. Va.
Casey	Gingery	Merritt, Conn.	Steagall
Cavichia	Goldsborough	Millard	Stubbs
Celler	Gray, Pa.	Mitchell, Ill.	Sullivan
Chandler	Greenwood	Montague	Summers, Tex.
Claiborne	Greever	Montet	Sweeney
Clark, Idaho	Griswold	Moritz	Taylor, Tenn.
Clark, N. C.	Haines	Mott	Thomas
Cochran	Hamlin	Murdock	Thompson
Cole, N. Y.	Hancock, N. C.	Nichols	Tobey
Colmer	Harlan	O'Day	Treadway
Cooley	Hartley	Oliver	Underwood
Corning	Healey	O'Malley	Walter
Crawford	Hobbs	Perkins	Weaver
Crosby	Hoeppel	Peyser	Werner
Culkin	Hollister	Pfeiffer	White
Cummings	Houston	Pierce	Wilson, Pa.
Dear	Igoe	Plumley	Withrow
Delaney	Johnson, W. Va.	Ramsay	Wolcott
DeRouen	Kahn	Randolph	Wolfenden
Dickstein	Keller	Reece	Woodrum
Dietrich	Kennedy, Md.	Reilly	Zimmerman
Dingell			

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, finding itself without a

quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 257 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its session.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an appropriation of \$20,000 annually is hereby authorized, \$10,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration; and \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the President and the executive secretary of the American group.

During the reading of the first section the following occurred:

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will continue the reading of the bill.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TINKHAM: Page 1, line 3, after the word "of", strike out "\$20,000."

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have made a motion to strike out the sum authorized to be appropriated. This legislation proposes for the first time a permanent authorization for a committal of the United States to this organization which is now discussing political affairs and not parliamentary matters. It meets at Geneva. It is a part of the general international set-up of affairs or mechanisms which is favored by internationalists and international Socialists.

In my opinion, the United States is absolutely opposed to any such internationalism and internationalists, and particularly to international socialism and international Socialists. By internationalism I mean political internationalism. The United States has learned its lesson and has paid in part the extortionate price.

When the vote is taken upon this amendment those voting will identify themselves as being either for traditional American principles and policies or for new international socialistic policies which would entangle us in European affairs.

It has been stated that none of the actions of the Interparliamentary Union are binding on the United States. The fact is, however, that before international commitments are made there usually are preliminary conditions and preliminary understandings which give character and direction to commitments. As I have stated, this is simply a movement toward Geneva, a movement toward entanglements in European political affairs. I have read the agenda which is to be considered by this organization, the Interparliamentary Union. I have shown that they are political and economic in character, that they do not relate to arbitration. Our joining this organization originally was because we were in favor of arbitration. I have shown how there is no more interest in arbitration and that now the matters that are discussed are political in character. Although it may be true that there are no binding commitments, nevertheless it is a movement in the wrong direction, toward political internationalism and European entanglements. One foot over the threshold into European political affairs and we are involved. What has been the result of our involvement in the political affairs of Europe, step by step, I stated to the committee perhaps an hour or an hour and a half ago.

I believe those Members of this body who are opposed to internationalism, international socialism, and to our participation in the political affairs of Europe should vote for the amendment which strikes out the amount to be authorized. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say to the Members of this House that my bewhiskered friend from Massachusetts is responsible for your being called over here at this late hour after we had heard him nearly 1 hour on this subject. In 2 minutes we would have been through, and I ask you to vote down everything they offer.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, the time on amendments under the rules is 5 minutes on a side. The gentleman has no right to debate this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word, which is an amendment to the amendment.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I will not occupy much of the time of the House. The distinguished chairman of the committee stated that my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] is responsible for their being here. He is, and if he had not been responsible I would have been. [Applause.]

Any Member of this House is entitled to call the Members over here on any matter which he considers important to the people of the United States.

Now, this is the I. L. O., the International Labor Organization story all over again in another form.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the last word.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, the last word is group. I will say, that to my mind, the Interparliamentary Union is a very bad group for United States representatives to join up with [applause], with foreign nations asking us to sit in on their Interparliamentary Union while they are passing out their foreign propaganda to us and then refusing to pay us a nickel of their debt to the United States when they are armed to the teeth, using our money to increase their armaments. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take further time of the House. I hope the House will vote down this European bill which is against the interests of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TINKHAM and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 178, noes 77.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOILEAU moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to delay consideration of this bill, but I had hoped to have an opportunity of asking a few questions of the chairman of the committee.

I have been advised that there is a gentleman who acts as executive secretary for the Interparliamentary Union in this country. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether that agent is a paid employee or whether he is working gratuitously because of his interest in the subject matter.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman means the clerk of the committee?

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I understand he is a paid employee.

Mr. BOILEAU. Now I ask the gentleman from what funds he is paid; who pays him?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I suggest that Mr. BLOOM answer that question.

Mr. BLOOM. The secretary gets \$50 a month and has been there a great many years. He is now being paid out of

an appropriation that was made by the Carnegie Institute, which made a donation out of which this salary of \$50 a month is paid. This man has been with the Interparliamentary Union a great many years.

Mr. BOILEAU. The reason I asked that question was because of the fact that it has been suggested to me there was a paid secretary. I was wondering from what source these funds were made available. I find no fault with the situation, and do not desire to reflect in any way against the gentleman who acts as secretary. I wanted the information, and I felt the Members of the House were entitled to it, because the suggestion was made that there was some other source from which the funds were made available for him and that it was a larger amount. I am entirely satisfied with the explanation made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRUAX. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not this paid employee—and I understand his name is Call—selects the Members of Congress who are to represent the United States in these conferences? The Congress itself, as I understand it, has nothing whatsoever to do with the selection of these members.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I may say to the gentleman that he does not.

Mr. TRUAX. Then who does?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. That question was asked Senator BARKLEY in the hearings before our committee. It is the duty of the president of the local union, which is Senator BARKLEY, in connection with the executive committee of the local union, to make this selection. The executive committee is elected by the Members of Congress who attend the meeting.

Mr. BOILEAU. Are there any other funds used to pay the secretary? Are there any other funds made available to pay any part of the expenses of the delegates to the Interparliamentary Conference?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. None that I know of.

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. How does the proposed appropriation in this bill compare with previous appropriations for the same purpose?

Mr. BOILEAU. I understand there was \$7,500 appropriated last year.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. It is the same amount.

Mr. BOILEAU. I understand there was \$7,500 in the last appropriation bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing his motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman is speaking on the merits of the bill.

Mr. MAAS. Does the gentleman think there are enough parliamentary governments left in the world to necessitate such an Interparliamentary Union?

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not care to express an opinion on that matter, except to say that I hope there will be more of them in the future.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] to strike out the enacting clause.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That the American group of the Interparliamentary Union shall submit to the Congress a report for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, including its expenditures under such appropriation.

Mr. McREYNOLDS and Mr. TINKHAM rose.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House—

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TINKHAM: On page 2, after line 6, insert a new section, to be known as "section 3", to read as follows:

"That all appointments to the Union Conference shall be made by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House."

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and the new section just offered be closed in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, if Members of this House and Members of the Senate are to be sent to Europe at public expense, which is the issue involved here, the selection should be made by the officials of these bodies. They should be made by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. It seems to me this is self-evident. We have had a debate here running an hour or an hour and one-half and it has been absolutely and completely obscure as to how these favored Members are appointed to these favored positions, having their expenses to Europe paid to discuss political affairs—political affairs largely, if not entirely, the political affairs of Europe.

This is a legitimate amendment. It is offered for a legitimate purpose and I cannot see how the committee can reject an amendment which provides that if public funds are to be expended out of the Treasury they shall be expended by public officials designated for that purpose. How is it reasonable to oppose such an amendment? How is it possible to authorize private individuals to dispose of public funds? How is it proper to allow Members of Congress to be sent to Europe or sent to Geneva to discuss international matters which, in my opinion, are entirely improper and out of order for American representatives in their official capacities to discuss, and not have their own officials say who shall be selected?

How can such an amendment be rejected in the name of honest and decent legislation, in the name of orderly government and of proper procedure concerning expenditures from the Public Treasury?

I submit the amendment is a legitimate one, is offered in good faith, and should be taken seriously by the committee.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) the Chair announced there were—ayes 90, noes 82.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. CONNERY, Mr. McCORMACK, and Mr. MARCAN-TONIO rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee demands tellers.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Did the Chair announce the noes had it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not announced the result. The Chair had announced the vote but not the result. The gentleman from Tennessee is entitled to demand tellers.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. As the Chair indicates some uncertainty, I withdraw the demand.

Mr. BLANTON. O Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet to demand tellers at the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Those favoring taking this vote by tellers—

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that business has intervened, that after the announcement of the ayes and noes on the rising vote, the gentleman from Tennessee was on his feet and moved that the Committee rise, and it was not until after that that a demand for tellers was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New Jersey in relation to the point of order that the Chair had announced the vote but had not announced the result, and it was not in order for the gentleman from Tennessee to make such motion until the result had been announced.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNERY. When the Chair announced the ayes and noes, did he announce the noes first or the ayes first?

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes first, but the Chair did not announce the result.

All those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After a pause.] Evidently a sufficient number, and tellers are ordered.

The Chair appointed as tellers Mr. McREYNOLDS and Mr. TINKHAM.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 99 ayes and 89 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and two Members present; not a quorum.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were closed, the Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 75]

Adair	Dietrich	Houston	O'Malley
Allen	Dingell	Igoe	Perkins
Andresen	Dirksen	Johnson, W. Va.	Peyser
Andrew, Mass.	Disney	Kahn	Pfeifer
Bankhead	Dondero	Kennedy, Md.	Pierce
Beam	Doutrich	Kennedy, N. Y.	Plumley
Bell	Duncan	Kerr	Quinn
Berlin	Dunn, Miss.	Kimball	Ramsay
Binderup	Eaton	Kleberg	Randolph
Bland	Engel	Kniffin	Rayburn
Bolton	Englebright	Lamneck	Reece
Brennan	Ferguson	Lee, Okla.	Relly
Brooks	Fernandez	Lemke	Rich
Brown, Mich.	Fish	Lesinski	Richards
Buckley, N. Y.	Flannagan	Lewis, Md.	Robertson
Burch	Ford, Calif.	Lucas	Robinson, Utah
Burdick	Ford, Miss.	McGoarty	Rogers, Okla.
Caldwell	Fulmer	McLaughlin	Romjue
Cannon, Wis.	Gambrill	McLeod	Russell
Carden	Gasque	McMillan	Ryan
Carpenter	Gassaway	McSwain	Sabath
Casey	Gearhart	Maloney	Sadowski
Cavichia	Gifford	Maverick	Sanders, La.
Celler	Gildea	May	Sandlin
Clalborne	Gillette	Meeks	Schaefer
Clark, Idaho	Goldsborough	Merritt, Conn.	Schuetz
Clark, N. C.	Gray, Penn.	Millard	Scott
Cochran	Greenwood	Mitchell, Ill.	Scrugham
Colmer	Greever	Montague	Seger
Cooley	Griswold	Montet	Shannon
Corning	Haines	Moritz	Short
Crosby	Hamlin	Mott	Sisson
Culkin	Hancock, N. C.	Murdock	Smith, Wash.
Cummings	Harlan	Nelson	Smith, W. Va.
Dear	Hartley	Nichols	Snyder
Delaney	Hobbs	O'Connell	Steagall
DeRoven	Hoeppel	O'Day	Stubbs
Dickstein	Hollister	Oliver	Sullivan

Sumners, Tex. Tobey Walter Wolcott
 Sutphin Tonry Warren Wolfenden
 Sweeney Treadway Weaver Woodrum
 Tarver Underwood Werner Zimmerman
 Taylor, Tenn. Vinson, Ga. Wilson, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and fifty-nine Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONNERY) there were 72 yeas and 123 noes.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 74, nays 172, not voting 185, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—74

Allen	Ekwall	Kinzer	Reed, Ill.
Amile	Fenerty	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.
Andrews, N. Y.	Focht	Kramer	Rogers, Mass.
Arends	Gavagan	Lambertson	Sauthoff
Bacon	Gehrmann	Lord	Schneider
Blackney	Goodwin	McAndrews	Secrest
Bolleau	Granfield	McCormack	Stefan
Buckbee	Guyer	McFarlane	Stewart
Buckler, Minn.	Halleck	McKeough	Taber
Carlson	Hancock, N. Y.	Maas	Thurston
Cole, Md.	Hess	Marcantonio	Tinkham
Collins	Higgins, Conn.	Marshall	Truax
Connery	Higgins, Mass.	Martin, Mass.	Turpin
Cooper, Ohio	Hoffman	Michener	Wadsworth
Crawford	Holmes	Mott	Wigglesworth
Crowther	Hope	O'Brien	Withrow
Darrow	Huddleston	Pittenger	Young
Ditter	Hull	Powers	
Dunn, Pa.	Jenkins, Ohio	Ransley	

NAYS—172

Arnold	Dorsey	Kloeb	Polk
Ayers	Doughton	Kocialkowski	Rabaut
Barden	Doxey	Kopplemann	Ramspeck
Beiter	Drewry	Kvale	Randolph
Berlin	Driscoll	Lambeth	Rankin
Biermann	Driver	Lanham	Richardson
Blanton	Duffey, Ohio	Larrabee	Rogers, N. H.
Bloom	Duffy, N. Y.	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, Okla.
Boehne	Eagle	Lehlbach	Sanders, Tex.
Boland	Eckert	Lewis, Colo.	Schulte
Brooks	Edmiston	Lewis, Md.	Sears
Brown, Ga.	Elcher	Lloyd	Shanley
Buchanan	Ellenbogen	Ludlow	Sirovich
Buck	Evans	Lundeen	Sisson
Bulwinkle	Faddis	McClellan	Smith, Conn.
Burnham	Farley	McGehee	Smith, Va.
Cannon, Mo.	Fiesinger	McGrath	South
Carmichael	Fitzpatrick	McLean	Spence
Carter	Fletcher	McReynolds	Stack
Cartwright	Frey	Mahon	Starnes
Castellow	Gingery	Mapes	Sutphin
Chandler	Gray, Ind.	Martin, Colo.	Taylor, Colo.
Chapman	Green	Mason	Taylor, S. C.
Christianson	Greenway	Massingale	Terry
Church	Gregory	Merritt, N. Y.	Thom
Citron	Gwynne	Miller	Thomason
Coffee	Hart	Mitchell, Tenn.	Thompson
Colden	Harter	Monaghan	Tolan
Cooper, Tenn.	Healey	Moran	Turner
Costello	Hennings	Nelson	Umstead
Cox	Hildebrandt	Norton	Utterback
Cravens	Hill, Ala.	O'Leary	Vinson, Ky.
Cross, Tex.	Hill, Knute	O'Neal	Wearin
Crosser, Ohio	Hill, Samuel B.	Owen	Welch
Crowe	Hook	Palmisano	West
Cullen	Imhoff	Parsons	Whelchel
Daly	Jenckes, Ind.	Patman	White
Darden	Johnson, Okla.	Patterson	Whittington
Deen	Johnson, Tex.	Patton	Wilcox
Dempsey	Jones	Pearson	Williams
Dies	Kee	Peterson, Fla.	Wilson, La.
Dobbins	Keller	Peterson, Ga.	Wood
Dockweiler	Kenney	Pettengill	Woodruff

NOT VOTING—185

Adair	Brennan	Casey	Culkin
Andresen	Brewster	Cavichia	Cummings
Andrew, Mass.	Brown, Mich.	Celler	Dear
Ashbrook	Brunner	Claborne	Delaney
Bacharach	Buckley, N. Y.	Clark, Idaho	DeRouen
Bankhead	Burch	Clark, N. C.	Dickstein
Beam	Burdick	Cochran	Dietrich
Bell	Caldwell	Cole, N. Y.	Dingell
Binderup	Cannon, Wis.	Colmer	Dirksen
Bland	Carden	Cooley	Disney
Bolton	Carpenter	Corning	Dondero
Boylan	Cary	Crosby	Doutrich

Duncan	Igoe	Nichols	Shannon
Dunn, Miss.	Jacobsen	O'Connell	Short
Eaton	Johnson, W. Va.	O'Connor	Smith, Wash.
Engel	Kahn	O'Day	Smith, W. Va.
Englebright	Kelly	Oliver	Snell
Ferguson	Kennedy, Md.	O'Malley	Snyder
Fernandez	Kennedy, N. Y.	Parks	Somers, N. Y.
Fish	Kerr	Perkins	Steagall
Flannagan	Kimball	Peyser	Stubbs
Ford, Calif.	Kleberg	Pfeifer	Sullivan
Ford, Miss.	Kniffin	Pierce	Sumners, Tex.
Fuller	Lamneck	Plumley	Sweeney
Fulmer	Lee, Okla.	Quinn	Tarver
Gambrill	Lemke	Ramsay	Taylor, Tenn.
Gasque	Lesinski	Rayburn	Thomas
Gassaway	Lucas	Reece	Tobey
Gearhart	Luckey	Reilly	Tonry
Gifford	McGroarty	Rich	Treadway
Gilchrist	McLaughlin	Richards	Underwood
Gildea	McLeod	Robertson	Vinson, Ga.
Gillette	McMillan	Robinson, Utah	Wallgren
Goldsborough	McSwain	Robison, Ky.	Walter
Gray, Pa.	Maloney	Romjue	Warren
Greenwood	Mansfield	Rudd	Weaver
Greever	Maverick	Russell	Werner
Griswold	May	Ryan	Wilson, Pa.
Haines	Mead	Sabath	Wolcott
Hamlin	Meeks	Sadowski	Wolfenden
Hancock, N. C.	Merritt, Conn.	Sanders, La.	Wolverton
Harlan	Millard	Sandlin	Woodrum
Hartley	Mitchell, Ill.	Schaefer	Zimmerman
Hobbs	Montague	Schuetz	Zioncheck
Hoepfel	Montet	Scott	
Hollister	Moritz	Scrugham	
Houston	Murdock	Seger	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Snell.
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Disney with Mr. Rich.
 Mr. Corning with Mr. Merritt of Connecticut.
 Mr. Fuller with Mr. Hollister.
 Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Dirksen.
 Mr. Kerr with Mr. Bolton.
 Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Harlan with Mr. Bacharach.
 Mr. Weaver with Mr. Culin.
 Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Doutrich.
 Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Bland with Mr. Gifford.
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Kimball.
 Mr. Maverick with Mr. McLeod.
 Mr. Boylan with Mr. Millard.
 Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Seger.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Tobey.
 Mr. Oliver with Mr. Short.
 Mr. McSwain with Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Hartley.
 Mr. Sandlin with Mr. Gilchrist.
 Mr. Mead with Mr. Dondero.
 Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Cole of New York.
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Andresen.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Burdick.
 Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Brewster.
 Mr. Robertson with Mr. Engel.
 Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Cavichia.
 Mr. Burch with Mr. Englebright.
 Mr. Brennan with Mrs. Kahn.
 Mr. Beam with Mr. Lemke.
 Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Gearhart.
 Mr. Brunner with Mr. Perkins.
 Mr. Maloney with Mr. Reece.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Plumley.
 Mr. Lucas with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
 Mr. Rudd with Mr. Wolcott.
 Mr. Montet with Mr. Thomas.
 Mr. Dear with Mr. Wolfenden.
 Mr. May with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
 Mr. Parks with Mr. Wolverton.
 Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Ferguson.
 Mr. Dietrich with Mr. O'Malley.
 Mr. Claiborne with Mr. Crosby.
 Mr. Lee of Oklahoma with Mr. McGroarty.
 Mr. Adair with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Luckey with Mr. Pfeifer.
 Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Pierce with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.
 Mr. Romjue with Mr. Russell.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Dingell.
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Ford of California.
 Mr. Quinn with Mr. Dickstein.
 Mr. Reilly with Mr. Clark of Idaho.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Mitchell of Illinois.
 Mr. Gillette with Mr. Ryan.
 Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Gambrill.
 Mr. Sabath with Mr. Snyder.
 Mr. Gasque with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Smith of Washington.
 Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Sadowski.
 Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Greever.

Mr. Stubbs with Mr. Haines.
 Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Hobbs.
 Mr. Tarver with Mr. Tonry.
 Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Houston.
 Mr. Warren with Mr. Zimmerman.
 Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Zioncheck.
 Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Werner.
 Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Walter.
 Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Underwood.
 Mr. Wallgren with Mr. Hoeppel.
 Mr. Igoe with Mr. Griswold.
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Gassaway.
 Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Schuetz.
 Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Cummings.
 Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Meeks.
 Mr. Cary with Mr. Buckley.
 Mr. Murdock with Mr. Nichols.
 Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. O'Connell.
 Mr. Carden with Mr. Robinson of Utah.
 Mr. Carpenter with Mr. Casey.
 Mr. McLaughlin with Mr. Peyser.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAWFORD) there were—ayes 105, noes 80.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 155, nays, 89, not voting 187, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—155

Arnold	Dies	Johnson, Okla.	Polk
Bacon	Dingell	Johnson, Tex.	Ramspeck
Barden	Dobbins	Jones	Randolph
Beiter	Dockweiler	Kee	Rankin
Biermann	Doughton	Keller	Richardson
Blanton	Doxey	Kloeb	Rogers, Mass.
Bloom	Drewry	Kocialkowski	Rogers, Okla.
Boehne	Driscoll	Kopplemann	Rudd
Boland	Driver	Kramer	Sanders, Tex.
Brooks	Duffy, N. Y.	Kvale	Sears
Brown, Ga.	Duncan	Lambeth	Shanley
Brunner	Dunn, Pa.	Lanham	Sirovich
Buck	Eagle	Lea, Calif.	Sisson
Bulwinkle	Eckert	Lehibach	Smith, Conn.
Burnham	Edmiston	Lewis, Colo.	Smith, Va.
Cannon, Mo.	Eicher	Lewis, Md.	South
Carmichael	Ellenbogen	Lloyd	Spence
Carter	Fiesinger	McGehee	Starnes
Cartwright	Fitzpatrick	McGrath	Taylor, Colo.
Castellow	Fletcher	McLean	Terry
Chapman	Frey	McReynolds	Thom
Christianson	Gingery	Mahon	Thompson
Church	Gray, Ind.	Mapes	Tolan
Citron	Green	Martin, Colo.	Turner
Coffee	Greenway	Mason	Umstead
Colden	Gregory	Massingale	Utterback
Cole, Md.	Gwynne	Merritt, N. Y.	Vinson, Ky.
Cooper, Tenn.	Hancock, N. Y.	Monaghan	Wallgren
Costello	Harter	Nelson	Weich
Cox	Healey	Norton	Whelchel
Cravens	Hennings	O'Neal	White
Cross, Tex.	Hildebrandt	Owen	Whittington
Crosser, Ohio	Hill, Ala.	Palmisano	Wilcox
Crowe	Hill, Knute	Parsons	Williams
Cullen	Hill, Samuel B.	Patman	Wilson, La.
Daly	Hook	Patton	Wood
Darden	Huddleston	Pearson	Woodruff
Deen	Imhoff	Peterson, Fla.	Zioncheck
Dempsey	Jenckes, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.	

NAYS—89

Allen	Crawford	Gehrmann	Kenney
Andrews, N. Y.	Crothier	Goodwin	Kinzer
Arends	Darrow	Granfield	Knutson
Ayers	Ditter	Guyer	Lambertson
Blackney	Dorsey	Halleck	Lord
Boileau	Duffey, Ohio	Hart	Ludlow
Buchanan	Englebright	Hess	Lundeen
Buckbee	Evans	Higgins, Conn.	McAndrews
Buckler, Minn.	Faddis	Higgins, Mass.	McClellan
Carlson	Farley	Hoffman	McCormack
Chandler	Fenerty	Holmes	McKeough
Collins	Focht	Hope	Maas
Connery	Ford, Miss.	Hull	Marcantonio
Cooper, Ohio	Gavagan	Jenkins, Ohio	Martin, Mass.

Michener
 Miller
 Mitchell, Tenn.
 Mott
 O'Brien
 O'Connor
 O'Leary
 Patterson
 Pittenger

Powers
 Rabaut
 Ransley
 Reed, Ill.
 Reed, N. Y.
 Rogers, N. H.
 Sauthoff
 Schneider
 Schulte

Secrest
 Stack
 Stefan
 Stewart
 Sutphin
 Taber
 Taylor, S. C.
 Thurston
 Tinkham

Truax
 Turpin
 Wadsworth
 Wigglesworth
 Withrow
 Young

NOT VOTING—187

Adair	Doutrich	Lee, Okla.	Robison, Ky.
Amlie	Dunn, Miss.	Lemke	Romjue
Andresen	Eaton	Lesinski	Russell
Andrew, Mass.	Ekwall	Lucas	Ryan
Ashbrook	Engel	Luckey	Sabath
Bacharach	Ferguson	McFarlane	Sadowski
Bankhead	Fernandez	McGroarty	Sanders, La.
Beam	Fish	McLaughlin	Sandlin
Bell	Flannagan	McLeod	Schaefer
Berlin	Ford, Calif.	McMillan	Schuetz
Binderup	Fuller	McSwain	Scott
Bland	Fulmer	Maloney	Scrugham
Bolton	Gambrill	Mansfield	Seger
Boylan	Gasque	Marshall	Shannon
Brennan	Gassaway	Maverick	Short
Brewster	Gearhart	May	Smith, Wash.
Brown, Mich.	Gifford	Mead	Smith, W. Va.
Buckley, N. Y.	Gilchrist	Meeks	Snell
Burdick	Gildea	Merritt, Conn.	Snyder
Caldwell	Gillette	Millard	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon, Wis.	Goldsborough	Mitchell, Ill.	Steagall
Carden	Gray, Pa.	Montague	Stubbs
Carpenter	Greenwood	Montet	Sullivan
Cary	Greever	Moran	Summers, Tex.
Casey	Griswold	Moritz	Sweeney
Caviechia	Haines	Murdock	Tarver
Celler	Hamlin	Nichols	Taylor, Tenn.
Clalborne	Hancock, N. C.	O'Connell	Thomas
Clark, Idaho	Harlan	O'Day	Thomason
Clark, N. C.	Hartley	Oliver	Tobey
Cochran	Hobbs	O'Malley	Tonry
Cole, N. Y.	Hoeppel	Parks	Treadway
Colmer	Hollister	Perkins	Underwood
Cooley	Houston	Pettengill	Vinson, Ga.
Corning	Igoe	Peyser	Walter
Crosby	Jacobsen	Pfeiffer	Warren
Culkin	Johnson, W. Va.	Pierce	Wearin
Cummings	Kahn	Plumley	Weaver
Dear	Kelly	Quinn	Werner
Delaney	Kennedy, Md.	Ramsay	West
DeRouen	Kennedy, N. Y.	Rayburn	Wilson, Pa.
Dickstein	Kerr	Reece	Wolcott
Dietrich	Kimball	Reilly	Wolfenden
Dirksen	Kleberg	Rich	Wolverton
Disney	Kniffin	Richards	Woodrum
Dondero	Lamneck	Robertson	Zimmerman
	Larrabee	Robinson, Utah	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
 On this vote:

Mr. Wearin (for) with Mr. Gilchrist (against).
 Mr. Thomason (for) Mr. McFarlane (against).

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Snell.
 Mr. Burch with Mr. Marshall.
 Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Perkins.
 Mr. Richards with Mr. Walcott.
 Mr. Pettengill with Mr. Ekwall.
 Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Amlie.
 Mr. Moran with Mr. Hamlin.
 Mr. West with Mr. Caldwell.
 Mr. Berlin with Mr. Colmer.
 Mr. Kelly with Mr. Binderup.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Lesinski.
 Mr. Gildea with Mr. Hoeppel.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA, BOND ISSUE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

MAY 15, 1935.

The SPEAKER,
 House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 21, Seventy-fourth Congress, I have this day presented to the President of the United States the signed duplicate copy of the enrolled bill, H. R. 6084, entitled "An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the electric light and power, water, and telephone properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co., and to finance and operate the same, and validating the preliminary proceedings with respect thereto, and for other purposes."

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
 Clerk of the House of Representatives.
 By H. NEWLIN MEGILL.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SCOTT, at the request of Mr. COLDEN, on account of sickness.

To Mr. HOBBS, at the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama, on account of important business.

To Mr. OLIVER, at the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama, on account of illness.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, with the understanding that no business of importance will be transacted between the hours of 11 a. m. and 12 m.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House that I may explain the reason. We hope to conclude general debate on the legislative appropriation bill and to have a vote in time to adjourn over Saturday. We have numerous requests on both sides of the Chamber for time, and it would be a great accommodation to a number of gentlemen who want to speak on the bill if we could have this extra hour. That is the reason for the request.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman had sufficient applications to speak to take up all of tomorrow in general debate?

Mr. LUDLOW. More than enough. We will probably run over a couple of hours on Friday. Tomorrow, with the consent of my colleague on the gentleman's side, it is my purpose to ask to close debate at 2 o'clock on Friday afternoon. That would give us plenty of time to complete the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is not the intention of the gentleman to read the bill tomorrow?

Mr. LUDLOW. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have a resolution being acted on by the Committee on the Judiciary. It went over yesterday as the unfinished business of today and will be the first order of business tomorrow morning. I do not know how that request will affect that resolution tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. It would not affect the resolution at all, because, as the gentleman stated, that is the unfinished business.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALY] is reporting on that resolution. Has he been informed about this?

Mr. LUDLOW. I have consulted on your side of the Chamber with the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. TABER, and also the ranking member on the subcommittee, Mr. POWERS, and I believe both gentlemen are agreeable to my request. I hope the gentleman from New York will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TRUAX. Reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this extra hour is for the purpose of allowing more Members to speak?

Mr. LUDLOW. That and nothing else.

Mr. TRUAX. Does not the gentleman think that in view of the small attendance now and the small attendance that will be here tomorrow at 11 o'clock, the same result would be accomplished by permitting Members to extend their own remarks?

Mr. LUDLOW. These gentlemen would like very much to have an opportunity to speak. I think no harm would be done to the public service or to any Members of this House by granting the request.

Mr. TRUAX. Only that we continually violate the N. R. A. and the 30-hour week.

Mr. LUDLOW. It will be an accommodation to a number of gentlemen who will obviously be crowded out unless we give them that extra hour. I would like for the House to know that in making this request for time I am thinking of a lot of very fine gentlemen who are our colleagues in this House, who would like to speak under the privilege of general debate on the legislative appropriation bill. I would like to accommodate everyone of them. That is why I am making this fight for extra time.

Mr. TRUAX. Does the gentleman assure us that no other business will be taken up at that hour in the morning?

Mr. LUDLOW. I can assure you that there will not be any other business of importance.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Well, that is just the point. That resolution will come up tomorrow morning.

Mr. LUDLOW. The unanimous consent request was that when we adjourn tonight we adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning so that we can get in an extra hour that will be devoted exclusively to debate and nothing else of any importance.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand this is not controversial.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the House that the unfinished business tomorrow is the resolution to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] referred, which has been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. How would that be affected by my unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. That would be the unfinished business, and that would have to be disposed of first on tomorrow.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I think that is perfectly all right. It will have to be disposed of in any event during the day. If we meet 1 hour earlier we will gain that much time, and the same end will be served. I have no objection to that.

Mr. CONNERY. Reserving the right to object, for the protection of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY], will the gentleman permit me to ask the gentleman from New York what that resolution calls for?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is a resolution of inquiry calling for certain information from the Attorney General's office on the kidnaping at Gallup, N. Mex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

A TRIBUTE TO OUR OLD-FASHIONED PIONEER MOTHERS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a very interesting and illuminating speech by my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON, of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, May 12, being Mother's Day, there was delivered in this Capital City a most eloquent and inspiring address by my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The address, on the subject entitled "Mother", was delivered before the Vaughn Bible Class, of the Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., one of the largest men's Sunday-school classes in the United States. This beautiful tribute to motherhood is of such Nation-wide interest that I have asked permission to have my colleague's address printed as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is worth reading and preserving. The address is as follows:

Members of the Vaughn class, ladies and gentlemen, and friends, today is Mother's Day in every town, hamlet, and community in this land. This is the one day of all days that good citizens everywhere, of all walks of life, of all trades and professions and avocations, pause to pay humble tribute to the sweetest, tenderest, and most revered of all names—that of Mother. As church bells this morning pealed forth what seemed to be the enchanting words, "Mother's Day"—"Mother's Day", the chimes of 10,000 bells rang out in our memory. This hour brings back to all of us the vision of the dearest face we have ever known. It revives all the countless and hallowed memories of the sweetest voice we

ever heard. Although that voice for many of us here today is now stilled, yet we rejoice in the thought that we know in our hearts her sacrificial life filled with helpful and kindly deeds to others lives on and on, with undiminished power.

To those of you who still have your mother with you, let me remind you how fortunate you are this Mother's Day. This should be a day of special rejoicing and thanksgiving for you. Today is a great homecoming for millions of mothers. It is a day of unusual happiness to the living mothers of this land. Let me suggest that if she is not too far away you go to that old mother of yours before the close of this day and pour out your heart to her as you did when you were a child. Tell her how dearly you love her and how much she still means to you. She will understand and will appreciate your presence immeasurably more than any gift you might send her. But if mother is too far distant, then let me urge that you send her a message of love that will fill her mother heart to the overflowing.

It is not essential to discuss at length the origin and purpose of Mother's Day. It will suffice to say that although Congress, by appropriate resolution in the year of 1914, officially designated the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day, this great movement was begun many years before then. It was in the year 1904 that Frank Herring, of Indiana, then a young silver-tongued orator, began a Nation-wide movement to have one day of the year set aside for Mother's Day. About the same time Miss Anna Jarvis, then of West Virginia but now of Philadelphia, began a Nation-wide campaign to have a special day designated by Congress to be known as Mother's Day. Last Friday Miss Jarvis sat in the gallery of the House of Representatives while many beautiful tributes were paid her. I might add also the records show that many fraternal, civic, and patriotic organizations endorsed the proposal. In the year of 1910 a great Nation-wide Sunday-school convention met in this city of Washington and unanimously endorsed the proposed Mother's Day. It is significant that 10,000 Sunday-school delegates marched by the National Capitol, and that Congress recessed out of respect to this great body of men and women, and to the Mother's Day movement they were so enthusiastically sponsoring.

This Nation now observes many important anniversaries. Our people celebrate with much pride the birthday anniversary of men who have served their country with distinction. We honor and revere the names of men who have won fame on field of battle, of statesmen who have fought and won battles in the Halls of Congress, poets, artists, sculptors, and inventors, but this day is a different kind of anniversary from any of the others. Someone has said that this is a "birthday anniversary of an idea that became an impulse." But it is more than that: it is, in fact, an impulse that almost overnight became a Nation-wide movement to honor the name and blessed memory of the moulder of men and nations—our mothers.

There is no other love in all the world comparable to that of a mother's love, and there is no other day in all the year that challenges the best that is in us as does Mother's Day. The very mention of Mother's Day, my friends, makes millions of hearts beat a little faster; it revives all the precious recollections of the past; it brings before us the most beautiful visions and the sweetest memories that any son or daughter can ever have. Today, we see mother's tears, her smiles, and once again hear her laughter and sweet lullabies of long ago. It makes our eyes grow dim with tears, our voices choke with emotion, and our hearts throb with tender vibrations as we reflect upon the unfathomable love of our devoted mothers.

Today, we forget for a time our own cares, our own heartaches and troubles, actual and imaginary, and let our minds wander back to days of yore. In our mind's eye we see an old home out yonder, somewhere, in the beautiful past; a home where "love lit the flame upon the altar", and where the name of God was honored and revered. We see a home where parents were loved, honored, and respected, and where a full measure of love was returned. As we reflect back to the childhood scenes of that old home of ours we see mother constantly working for us. Often we have been made to wonder how a busy mother managed to do so much for us; how she toiled, slaved, and sacrificed so cheerfully and unstintingly that her offspring might be given every possible opportunity to meet and solve life's problems.

This day of all days each one of us is thinking of the years spent with our own dear mother. Everything else seems to sink into oblivion. We see her first as we cuddle in her arms and hear her as she hums sweet lullabies until the sandman leads us gently into realms of slumber. We see her as she tenderly tucks us away and then lifts her eyes from us long enough to utter a fervent prayer to "Him who holds in the hollow of His hand the fate of nations and, yet, who notes the sparrow's fall" to guard and protect her child through the night. We see her as she read daily from the old family Bible and taught us to say so many of her favorite scripture verses. Those winter evenings, by the old open fireplace, are so sacred to us now. It was there we learned to lip our childish prayer of "Now I lay me down to sleep."

Again we see mother as she hustled us off to Sunday school, rain or shine, year in and year out. Mine was an old-fashioned pioneer mother who didn't believe in sending her children to Sunday school, but oh how she believed in taking them there! Excuses didn't go in our family household. The Bible, the book of all books, was honored and respected in our old home and the Biblical injunction to "remember the Sabbath Day and keep it holy" was interpreted to mean, among other things, to be at Sunday school and church every Sunday on time.

We see her again as we attended the little one-room country school, and recall how she shared with us our childish disappointments just as she rejoiced with us in our pleasures. Never was she too busy with her sewing, mending, cooking, and cleaning to solve those terrible old arithmetic problems that we had announced had the wrong answers. Nor was she too engrossed in social affairs to hear and solve any little personal problems of one of her children. Not only was she possessed of dauntless courage but she sought to imbue in her children the spirit of never say fail. She also instilled ideals and ambitions that only a loving, thoughtful mother can transmit to her children. She willingly endured countless hardships and privations that her children might have opportunities that she had been denied.

Again we see our old-fashioned mother as if it were yesterday. Another son was going away from home for the first time to college. After each of the other members of the family had given him advice, jokingly and otherwise, my mother stood there at the gate of the old farmyard and as she gave her farewell kisses said, "Good-bye, son, write your mother as often as you can. Be a good boy, and remember mother will be praying for you." This world needs more old-fashioned praying mothers.

A few years later the same dear old mother stood at the same gate to say good-bye to her soldier boy who was soon to go across the sea to engage in battle, against those whom he had never seen, in order to help "make the world safe for democracy." Vivid in my memory is the picture of my dear old, horny-handed father—God bless his memory—as he proudly took me by the hand, wished me Godspeed, and declared he was pleased that his son was giving his services for the defense of Old Glory. I can see him now as he stood there gripping my hand and bravely striving to keep back the tears as he gave assurance that it was glorious to fight for one's country in time of peril. But the most vivid scene that comes before me now, the picture that one could never forget, is that of my dear old mother. She felt that the price American mothers were called upon to pay for war was entirely too great. She felt that war was so useless, uncivilized, and barbaric; in fact, she hated war, just as all real mothers must loathe it. Though her faith in God was unbounded, she had no faith in the idea, or should I say, propaganda that it was a "war to end wars." And I might add here, incidentally, that if no future wars are ever fought by the nations of the earth until same are sanctioned by the mothers of men who must do the fighting, there will be no more wars in the land, but peace will breathe as fragrantly throughout the world as if the day of its redemption had come!

My mother, who had endured droughts, diseases, hardships, privations, pestilence, and storms, stood the ordeal of saying good-bye very bravely. As she followed her son out in the yard for her parting words one could never forget the tragic look on her angelic face. I see her now, with her lips quivering and tears trickling down the most beautiful cheeks in the world to me. Although nearly a score of years have passed since then, it seems only yesterday that mother clung to me that day, and then at the final parting smiled through her tears as she whispered once again, "My son, be a good boy, write as often as possible, and always remember that mother will be praying for you." No one can ever know what that mother's parting words in the trying days that have passed have meant, not only in the months that followed in training camps and later on those long hikes in the rain to the front, but still later during those nerve-racking days and nights up in what they called "no man's land." During all those times I could hear my mother's audible voice gently pealing out, "Be a good boy and always remember mother will be praying for you."

Although my own mother has gone to her reward, I rejoice in the thought that the power of her parting admonition has been my inspiration and comfort in every trying hour. Just as mother's prayers were a consolation to me during those long, dark, and terrifying days, it was no less consoling in the years that followed to feel that dear old mother was daily praying that her son might be remembered at the throne of mercy. May it ever be our aim and prayer that we so shape our lives and personal conduct that it would meet with mother's approbation if she were here.

What may be said of the life and character of one pioneer mother could also be said, in a large measure, of the sacrificial lives of millions of our mothers who have graced American homes. Whether that home was situated out in the country, an humble cottage in town or a lofty city mansion, the inspiration that American motherhood has been to the millions of sons and daughters of this land is utterly incalculable.

Words fail us as we endeavor to pay our tributes to those dauntless, courageous, and sacrificial souls we are so proud to call our mothers. Our words are so empty; nothing we could say could add to her glory. But we might show our respect and sincere affection for the cherished memory of mother by doing our bit to see that the crosses of other mothers are made more easy to bear.

This afternoon the annual Mother's Day program will be held yonder in the great amphitheater near the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery. Eight years ago I attended my first Mother's Day program at Arlington. Never shall I forget how a sweet-faced but poorly clad mother, with shoulders stooped from many years of toil and whose hair was snowy white with the frost of many winters, made her way up to the Unknown Soldier's Tomb and placed a little bouquet of wild flowers on it, and as she looked up into my face very earnestly, she said: "Who knows, this may be my only son."

In yesterday's mail I received a brief letter from a lonely mother living in Blaine County, Oklahoma, in the district I have the honor to represent in Congress. The letter was pasted on the outside of a package containing the rose that I today wear on my coat lapel. I shall read the letter to you:

"DEAR MR. JOHNSON: In memory of the son I lost I made this rose for you and trust that you will wear it Mother's Day in memory of your mother you lost not so long ago."

The letter is signed by Mrs. Lola Cronkhite Higbee, Hitchcock, Okla. May I add that I feel highly honored to wear this beautiful white flower, not only in honor of the memory of my own mother, but also to honor the memory of the dear son of this bereaved mother.

As we revel in all the tender memories that Mother's Day brings us let us not forget those mothers whose hearts are made sad today for that son who did not return but who paid the supreme sacrifice. Then, too, there are many other good mothers who have lost their sons and daughters and whose hearts are aching today. Let us not forget the aged mother of Senator Cutting, that great stalwart progressive statesman who lost his life so tragically a few days ago and whom the entire Nation mourns today.

Not only are there mothers who are sad because of the loss of loved ones but thousands of other mothers are homeless, penniless, and hungry, through no fault of their own. On this Mother's Day in this the richest land on earth, there are literally hundreds of thousands of mothers who are wondering where the next meal will come from to give sustenance to their offspring. Beautiful poems and pleasant platitudes will not suffice for such unfortunate mothers. The humane societies take care of old horses everywhere when they get too old and poor to work, but in this land of ours there are at least 7,000,000 dependent and aged fathers and mothers who, thus far, have been ignored by this great Government.

On this Mother's Day let us reconsecrate and rededicate our own lives to the ideals that our mothers held so sacred, and for which they gave their all so unstintingly. Let us show our appreciation, our honor and respect for the memory of the motherhood of America by caring for the living. May the blessed memories of our God-fearing, self-sacrificing mothers ever be an inspiration and a guiding star in our lives, until we, that day, by the grace and mercy of God, shall meet our mothers yonder in a brighter world, where there shall be no good-byes, and we shall live forever with Him in the land where the sun never sets and from "whence no traveler shall ever return."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 1935, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(Thursday, May 16, 10:30 a. m.)

Committee will hold hearings on bill (H. R. 3473) to clarify the contract laborers provision of the immigration law with regard to alien actors.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

(Thursday, May 16, 10:30 a. m.)

Committee will hold hearings on various bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

336. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to amend an act providing for the restoration of Fort McHenry, in the State of Maryland, and its permanent preservation as a national park and perpetual national memorial shrine as the birthplace of the immortal The Star-Spangled Banner, written by Francis Scott Key; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

337. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill amending section 304 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

338. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill amending sections 1 and 6 of the so-called "Harrison Narcotic Law"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

339. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States the devise and be-

quest of real and personal property of the late Paul E. McDonnold, passed assistant surgeon with the rank of lieutenant commander, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

340. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1934 and prior fiscal years in the amount of \$100,467.04, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1935 in the amount of \$64,413.86; in all, \$164,880.90 (H. Doc. No. 188); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

341. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriations for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1934, in the sum of \$55.50 (H. Doc. No. 187); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

342. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, in the amount of \$300,000, to carry out during the fiscal year 1936 the provisions of the act approved February 22, 1935, entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes" (H. Doc. No. 186); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

343. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of Thomas F. Gardiner against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. PIERCE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6776. A bill to amend section 36 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONNERY: Committee on Labor. H. R. 7940. A bill to prohibit the interstate transportation of prison-made products in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 7322. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a central research and experiment station of the Bureau of Mines at Salt Lake City, Utah; with amendment (Rept. No. 951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8052. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 830. A bill for the relief of Samuel Madison Strange; with amendment (Rept. No. 921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2421. A bill for the relief of John R. Allgood; with amendment (Rept. No. 922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Ben D. Showalter; with amendment (Rept. No. 923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2970. A bill for the relief of Jose Munden; with amendment (Rept. No. 924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2974. A bill for the relief of Frank W. Childress; with amendment (Rept. No. 925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3282. A bill for the relief of Nina Drips; with amendment (Rept. No. 926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3562. A bill for the relief of Mary A. Cox; with amendment (Rept. No. 927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3762. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to determine the claim of Lewis E. Magwood; with amendment (Rept. No. 928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4364. A bill for the relief of Andrew Johnson; with amendment (Rept. No. 929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Albert Gonzales; with amendment (Rept. No. 930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4697. A bill for the relief of Ralph Riesler; with amendment (Rept. No. 931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4829. A bill for the relief of Weymouth Kirkland and Robert N. Goding; with amendment (Rept. No. 932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4848. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Molster, disbursing clerk, Department of Commerce, and Dr. Louis H. Bauer, a former employee; with amendment (Rept. No. 933). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4851. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian employees of the naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va., for the value of tools lost in a fire at Pier No. 7, at the naval operating base, on May 4, 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 934). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4923. A bill for the relief of Maj. E. Leslie Medford, United States property and disbursing officer for Maryland; without amendment (Rept. No. 935). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles F. Eikenberg; with amendment (Rept. No. 936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5097. A bill for the relief of Mary E. Lord; with amendment (Rept. No. 937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5150. A bill for the relief of Alexander E. Kovner; with amendment (Rept. No. 938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5311. A bill for the relief of John Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5635. A bill for the relief of the mayor and aldermen of Jersey City, Hudson County, N. J., a municipal corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5827. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Wyhowski; with amendment (Rept. No. 941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7577. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William E. Smith and Clara Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 942). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. S. 780. An act for the relief of the Standard Dredging Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. S. 925. An act to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William W. Danenhower; with amendment (Rept. No. 944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 1073. An act for the relief of Louis Finger; without amendment (Rept. No. 945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 1290. An act for the relief of Walter Motor Truck Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1431. An act for the relief of the Collier Manufacturing Co., of Barnesville, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SEGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1817. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, consider, and render judgment on the claim of Squaw Island Freight Terminal Co., Inc., of Buffalo, N. Y., against the United States in respect of loss of property occasioned by the breaking of a Government dike on Squaw Island; without amendment (Rept. No. 948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 2205. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Cooney; without amendment (Rept. No. 949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2487. An act for the relief of the Western Electric Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 950). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rules XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 8073) to improve the health of the people of Puerto Rico by providing for an adequate meat supply; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McSWAIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 8074) to amend the act of March 3, 1925, relating to Fort McHenry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 8075) to make further provision for the abatement and refund of Federal taxes on insolvent banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEVER: A bill (H. R. 8076) to provide for the creation of a series of national parks to be known as the "Western Trails National Parks", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 8077) to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the shore of Illinois at or near Montrose Harbor, Cook County, Chicago; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 8078) to repeal sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act approved February 3, 1909; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEFAN: A bill (H. R. 8079) authorizing the erection of memorial statues of Maj. Frank North and Capt. Luther H. North; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the ratification of Joint Resolution No. 59 of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, approved by the Governor May 5, 1930, imposing an import duty on coffee imported into Puerto Rico", approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 291) making immediately available the appropriation for the fiscal year 1936 for construction, repair, and maintenance of Indian-reservation roads; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 292) to clarify the definition of total permanent disability for purpose of automatic insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYERS: A bill (H. R. 8080) to authorize the issuance of a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe, Crowe allottee no. 1555; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 8081) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of Diemer Bathurst; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8082) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of Nancy Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8083) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of Deatlef C. Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEHRMANN: A bill (H. R. 8084) for the relief of John Hoffman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8085) for the relief of John Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8086) granting a pension to Margaret Mary Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 8087) granting a pension to Mary J. Harvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GWYNNE: A bill (H. R. 8088) for the relief of Mrs. Nahwista Carr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 8089) for the relief of Joseph J. Baylin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 8090) granting a pension to Catherine Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8091) for the relief of Fields B. Arthur and Arthur L. Allen, copartners, doing business as Arthur & Allen, and as assignees of Edward F. Rizer and A. B. Hoffman; also for the relief of the Colorado Culvert & Flume Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORITZ: A bill (H. R. 8092) to refund to Mary Wilkins Ogden income tax erroneously and illegally collected for the calendar year 1928; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 8093) granting a pension to Margaret Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 8094) for the relief of Dr. J. C. Blalock; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8095) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, consider, and render judgment on the claims of Joliet National Bank, of Joliet, Ill., and Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, of Joliet, Ill., arising out of loans to the Joliet Forge Co., of Joliet, Ill., for the providing of additional plant facilities and material for the construction of steel forgings during the World War; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 8096) granting a pension to Margaret Teed; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHORT: A bill (H. R. 8097) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Nobles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8473. By Mr. BOYLAN: Letter from the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York, New York City, approving the Mead shorter work-week bill (H. R. 6990) providing for a shorter work week in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

8474. Also, resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day

resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8475. By Mr. DEROUEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, urging the enactment of the Frazier-Lemke bill without further delay; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8476. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of board of trustees, Pulaski, N. Y., memorializing Congress to adopt October 11 as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8477. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution adopted by the people of Cresskill, N. J., and citizens from neighboring communities in mass meeting assembled at Cresskill, N. J., April 25, 1935, favoring the adoption of a plan perfected by Maj. L. Alfred Jenny for linking northeastern New Jersey with New York by rapid transit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8478. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Joint resolution of the City Council of the City of Providence, petitioning the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the processing tax on cotton and to enact legislation to protect the cotton-textile industry against importations of goods manufactured by cheap labor abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8479. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York and vicinity concerning the Mead shorter work-week bill (H. R. 6990); to the Committee on Labor.

8480. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Samuel B. Pierce and some 37 other residents of Bellows Falls, Vt., urging favorable action on Senate bill 1629, to regulate trucking in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8481. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, New York City, concerning the Crosser House Joint Resolution 219, Emergency Railroad Transportation Act extension; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8482. Also, petition of Common Council of the City of Pulaski and the State of New York, favoring the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8483. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of citizens of Cedar Grove, W. Va., asking that Congress allow the Federal gasoline tax to expire at the end of the present fiscal year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8484. By Mr. STEFAN: Resolution adopted by the Nebraska House of Representatives, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law the Nye-Sweeney bill (H. R. 6382); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8485. By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to taking the profits out of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8486. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the central executive body of district no. 22, U. M. W. A., of the Utah division; to the Committee on Labor.

8487. Also, petition of a mass meeting of various trade and labor unions, Canal and Claiborne Streets, New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 16, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, May 13, 1935)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 15, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House